



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

EVALUATION

LGBTI GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP

**Submitted February 2, 2018;
Revised March 19, 2018; May 11, 2018; June 13, 2018**

This publication was produced at the request of the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared independently by NORC at the University of Chicago.

LGBTI Global Development Partnership Evaluation

Submitted February 2, 2018

Revised March 19, 2018

Revised May 11, 2018

Revised June 13, 2018

Prepared under Contract No.: GS-10F-0033M / AID-OAA-M-13-00013. Tasking N065

Submitted to:

USAID/DCHA/DRG

Submitted by:

Ritu Nayyar-Stone (Team Leader)

Piotr Pawlak (Senior LGBTI/Gender Expert)

Letitia Onyango (Gender Expert)

Contractor:

NORC at the University of Chicago

Attention: Renee Hendley

Bethesda, MD 20814

Tel: 301-634-9489: Email: Hendley-Renee@norc.org

DISCLAIMER

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 1 |
| 1.0 EVALUATION PURPOSE & QUESTIONS | 6 |
| 1.1 Evaluation Purpose..... | 6 |
| 1.2 Evaluation Questions..... | 7 |
| 1.3 Evaluation Design and Method..... | 8 |
| 2.0 PROGRAM CONTEXT AND OBJECTIVES | 9 |
| 2.1 Program Context..... | 9 |
| 2.2 Program Objectives | 10 |
| <i>Grantmaking</i> | 10 |
| <i>Research</i> | 10 |
| <i>CommsLabs</i> | 11 |
| <i>Democratic Participation Training</i> | 12 |
| 3.0 EVALUATION METHODS AND LIMITATIONS..... | 13 |
| 3.1 Evaluation management..... | 14 |
| 3.2 Study design | 14 |
| 3.3 Interviews..... | 15 |
| 3.4 Site Selection | 15 |
| 3.5 Limitations..... | 16 |
| 4.0 FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS BY KEY EVALUATION QUESTION..... | 16 |
| 4.1 Central Question: How effective has the GDP been? | 16 |
| 4.1.1 <i>What are the core elements of effective GDP support?</i> | 18 |
| 4.1.2 <i>To what extent has the GDP facilitated organizational change?</i> | 26 |
| 4.1.3 <i>How has the GDP increased capacity and changed approaches to capacity-building for LGBTI individuals and CSOs?</i> | 29 |
| 4.1.4 <i>How has the GDP enhanced coordination between and among grantee organizations, implementing, and donor partners? Has the GDP helped create and sustain linkages between LGBTI advocacy groups and organizations?</i> | 33 |

| | | |
|-------|--|----|
| 4.1.5 | <i>How effective have the GDP's efforts been in leveraging additional resources, linkages, partnerships, and opportunities with and among implementing and donor partners, advocacy groups, and other organizations?</i> | 35 |
| 4.1.6 | <i>In what ways has GDP support helped LGBTI organizations overcome challenges in pursuing their objectives? Have beneficiaries experienced any challenges in accessing / utilizing GDP support?..</i> | 36 |
| 4.1.7 | <i>What are the areas of improvement for effective GDP support?</i> | 41 |
| 4.2 | <i>What is the impact of the LGBTI GDP on beneficiaries?</i> | 44 |
| 4.2.1 | <i>What have been the effects of GDP interventions on beneficiaries and their communities?</i> | 45 |
| 4.2.2 | <i>Which trainings provided by the GDP have been most useful? What challenges have been encountered? Which trainings could be improved, and how?</i> | 51 |
| 4.2.3 | <i>How effective have the CommsLabs been in strengthening advocacy?</i> | 52 |
| 4.2.4 | <i>What is the value of the GDP's research activities? How have the research products been used?</i> | 52 |
| 4.2.5 | <i>Have beneficiary organizations supported individuals across the LGBTI spectrum? To what extent? Why or why not? What were the challenges with providing this support?</i> | 54 |
| 5.0 | CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 54 |
| | Recommendations | 58 |

LIST OF ACRONYMS

| | |
|-----------|--|
| CSO | Civil society organization |
| CommsLabs | Media, Communications and Technology Lab |
| GDA | Global Development Alliance |
| GDP | Global Development Partnership |
| HIV/AIDS | Human Immunodeficiency Virus / Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome |
| KII | Key informant interview |
| LAC | Latin America and the Caribbean |
| LGBTI | Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and intersex |
| M&E | Monitoring and evaluation |
| MSC | Most Significant Change |
| NGLCC | National LGBT Chamber of Commerce |
| NGO | Non-governmental organization |
| NORC | NORC at the University of Chicago |
| RFSL | Swedish Federation for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Rights |
| Sida | Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency |
| SOGIE | Sexual orientation and gender identity and expression |
| USAID | United States Agency for International Development |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Intersex (LGBTI) Global Development Partnership (GDP) is a collaborative initiative and first-of-its kind public-private partnership between the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida), and several other resource and implementing partners. The GDP has worked in 14 countries in four regions: Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC), Sub-Saharan Africa, the Balkans, and South Asia. The GDP is comprised of two Global Development Alliances (GDAs)¹ and programming managed by Sida. The GDP seeks to address violence and discrimination faced by LGBTI people by:

- Strengthening the capacity of LGBTI leaders and civil society organizations (CSOs);
- Training LGBTI leaders to effectively participate in democratic processes and run organizations;
- Conducting research to inform national, regional, and global policy and programs; and
- Promoting economic empowerment through enhanced LGBTI entrepreneurship and business development.

This evaluation focuses on the two GDAs of the GDP, which take a multi-pronged approach to addressing the violence, discrimination, and exclusion faced by LGBTI people in developing countries.

GDA ¹: The Global LGBTI Human Rights Partnership (2012-2018) is a project that aims to build the capacity of LGBTI leaders and CSOs through grants, trainings, and research. The lead implementing partner is the Astraea Lesbian Foundation for Justice (Astraea), which conducted research, administered small grants, led strategic communications/training initiatives. The LGBTQ Victory Institute (Victory Institute) and the Williams Institute also served as implementing partners, implementing projects focused on democratic participation and research, respectively. RFSL, an implementing partner of Sida, ran a parallel program that carefully coordinated with this part of the GDP.²

¹ GDAs are USAID mechanisms for public-private partnerships. Each of the GDAs in the GDP are 1) funded by USAID, Sida, and third party organizations (“leverage partners”) including corporations and private foundations, and 2) co-managed by USAID and Sida.

² “Rainbow Leaders,” the Sida-funded program implemented by RFSL, trained 120 global LGBTI advocates in organizational leadership, management, and fundraising. This program was evaluated separately; the report is available [here](#).

GDA 2: Promoting Global LGBTI Equality through Entrepreneurship & Small- and Medium-Sized Enterprise Growth in Developing Countries and Regions (2013-2020) is a project that aims to increase the capacity of LGBTI entrepreneurs and business owners and connect LGBTI people with employment opportunities in non-discriminatory environments. The implementing partner of this project is the National LGBT Chamber of Commerce (NGLCC).

EVALUATION PURPOSE AND QUESTIONS

The purpose of the evaluation is to gain a deeper understanding of the activities and impact of the GDP's two GDAs. This evaluation does not address activities after September 2017; nor does it attempt to evaluate all GDP activities across all countries, as each individual project and component of the GDP will be evaluated separately in due course. Instead, this evaluation provides higher-level analysis by using document reviews, key informant interviews (KII) with participants at all levels (1 - donor, 2 - implementing partner, 3 - grantee organization/CSO partner, and 4 - end beneficiary), and the identification of beneficiary impact stories (using the "Most Significant Change" methodology) to help understand:

- I. How effective has the LGBTI GDP been?
- II. What is the impact of the LGBTI GDP on beneficiaries?

KEY ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The evaluation found the GDP's accomplishments included the following:

- Provided grants totaling over \$3 million (over 85% of which were leveraged funds³ – i.e., funds not from USAID or Sida) to 65 LGBTI CSOs in 12 countries that strengthened the capacity of LGBTI leaders and CSOs to address violence and discrimination;
- Established and facilitated capacity building trainings, including
 - Three Media, Communications, and Technology Labs (CommsLabs) that brought together LGBTI people and technologists to identify tools that can support/protect LGBTI advocates;
 - Training 229 LGBTI leaders across all four of the GDP's focus regions in democratic participation;
- Conducted and published ground-breaking research designed to inform policy, including

³ Implementing partners are required to leverage USAID's funds with third-party contributions (i.e., from corporations, private foundations) at a minimum 1:1 ratio.

- Ten landscape analyses documenting the social, political, and economic conditions for LGBTI people in ten countries and one sub-region (including recommendations for allies, advocates, and funders);
- 17 research publications about LGBTI political participation in developing countries;
- *The Relationship between LGBT Inclusion and Economic Development: An Analysis of Emerging Economies*⁴ – a groundbreaking study that showed a positive correlation between LGBTI inclusion and gross domestic product per capita;
- Supported enhanced economic opportunities for LGBTI people, including
 - Established/supported LGBTI Chambers of Commerce/Business Organizations in six countries;
 - Trained and provided networking opportunities for over 2,175 LGBTI entrepreneurs and businesses; and
 - Registered over 80 LGBTI-owned businesses in an international supplier registry, building an international approach to supplier diversity.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Question 1: How effective has the LGBTI GDP been?

This evaluation found that the GDP has been very effective in achieving its goals, and that the composition and structure of the GDP was a driving factor for its efficacy. The multi-partner structure of the GDP promoted positive changes within donor partners, implementing partners, and grantee organizations/CSO partners including internal growth, expansion of programs, improved management systems, and broad expansion of existing networks.

The evaluation concludes that the 1) small grants to LGBTI CSOs were effectively used to help advance protections from violence and discrimination; 2) trainings have significantly strengthened the capacities and abilities of LGBTI people and organizations advocate for their own human rights and improve their lives; 3) research and analysis produced under the GDP have been used by broad range of stakeholders to inform in-country programming and raise awareness of the harsh realities faced by LGBTI people in developing countries, as well as to increase understanding of the connections between LGBTI inclusion and economic development; and 4) economic empowerment

⁴ Badgett, M., Nezhad, S., Waaldijk, K., & van der Meulen Rodgers, Y. (2014). *The Relationship between LGBT Inclusion and Economic Development: An Analysis of Emerging Economies*. UCLA: The Williams Institute. It is available [here](#).

initiatives have provided LGBTI individuals in developing countries with networks, skills, and resources to advance economically despite the stigma and discrimination they face.

This evaluation also found that the GDP had distinct and positive impacts for grantee organizations/CSO partners and implementing partner organizations. For grantee organizations/CSO partners, the GDP was instrumental in addressing specific vulnerabilities (i.e., violence, discrimination) across LGBTI groups, and promoting the effective and sustainable use of financial resources. Further trainings supported by the GDP helped grantee organizations and individual beneficiaries expand valuable skills in organizational leadership, democratic participation, and digital safety/advocacy. For implementing partners, the GDP improved their financial sustainability through resource mobilization and leveraging new funding opportunities. The GDP built on the expertise of resource and implementing partners to help each partner expand their global footprint. These findings indicate that the collaborative, coordinated efforts of the GDP are critical to continued efforts to protect LGBTI people in developing countries from violence and discrimination.

Question 2: What is the impact of the LGBTI GDP on beneficiaries?

The GDP has had wide-spanning positive impacts on beneficiaries, especially in addressing the day-to-day challenges that result from the violence and discrimination faced by LGBTI individuals. Grants, training (i.e., CommsLabs, democratic participation trainings), and research activities have helped grantee organizations provide improved support for individual beneficiaries. This evaluation also found that grantee organizations helped individual beneficiaries navigate social and institutional discrimination, develop a greater awareness of their human rights, and advocate for themselves and others. These tools have helped beneficiaries identify and create inclusive environments, including work places. The evaluation also found that GDP activities had some unexpected positive impacts on beneficiaries, including 1) confidence building, 2) access to networks that reduced feelings of isolation and unlocked opportunities for organizing, and 3) a sense of personal empowerment and ability to advocate for protections and rights.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This evaluation found that the GDP's interventions resulted in unique benefits for participants at all levels. This evaluation also found several areas for the GDP to consider as it continues to make significant achievements in protecting LGBTI people in developing countries from violence and discrimination.

First, the evaluation found that GDP could better facilitate improved, long-term connections, coordination, and communication between organizations at all levels (1 – donor, 2 – implementing partner, 3 – grantee organization/CSO partner), potentially

including the creation of a private listserv or a dedicated space for sharing resources, best practices, success stories, and lessons learned. The evaluation also found that crucial to the GDP's success has been its approach to ensuring interventions are highly tailored to the unique contexts and needs of each focus country; this approach should be maintained, and in some cases enhanced, moving forward. This evaluation also found opportunities for new or expanded programming focused on providing psychosocial support and emergency response grants to LGBTI individuals/organizations and infusing research (i.e., academic quantitative analyses) and economic empowerment considerations across the GDP. Finally, the evaluation recommends the GDP consider applying strategic advocacy and communications efforts to engage allies and a broader audiences to address the root causes of violence and discrimination facing LGBTI people.

1.0 EVALUATION PURPOSE & QUESTIONS

1.1 EVALUATION PURPOSE

The Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Intersex (LGBTI) Global Development Partnership (GDP) is a collaborative initiative and first-of-its kind public-private partnership between the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Swedish International Development Agency (Sida), and several other resource⁵ and implementing partners. The GDP has worked in four regions: Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC), sub-Saharan Africa, the Balkans, and South Asia. The initiative is comprised of two Global Development Alliances (GDAs)⁶: (1) The Global LGBTI Human Rights Partnership, and (2) Promoting Global LGBTI Equality through Entrepreneurship & Small and Medium Enterprise (SME) Growth in Developing Countries and Regions. In addition, Sida funded parallel programming implemented by the Swedish Federation for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Rights (RFSL). Together the GDP seeks to address violence and discrimination faced by LGBTI people by:

- Strengthening the capacity of LGBTI leaders and civil society organizations (CSOs);
- Training LGBTI leaders to effectively participate in democratic processes and run organizations;
- Conducting research to inform national, regional, and global policy and programs; and
- Promoting economic empowerment through enhanced LGBTI entrepreneurship and business development.

This evaluation seeks to assess how and to what extent the GDP has accomplished its purpose to support and empower LGBTI individuals and CSOs in developing countries as they advocate for their own human rights and seek to improve their lives.

Specifically, the evaluation helps create a deeper understanding of the activities and impact of the GDP's two GDAs⁷ through September 2017. The results of the evaluation

⁵ Implementing partners are required to leverage USAID's funds with third-party contributions (i.e., from corporations, private foundations) at a minimum 1:1 ratio.

⁶ GDAs are USAID mechanisms for public-private partnerships. Each of the GDAs in the GDP are 1) funded by USAID, Sida, and third party organizations ("leverage partners") including corporations and private foundations, and 2) co-managed by USAID and Sida.

⁷ "Rainbow Leaders," the Sida-funded program implemented by RFSL, trained 120 global LGBTI advocates in organizational leadership, management, and fundraising. This program was evaluated separately; the report is available [here](#).

also help identify promising approaches to protect LGBTI people from violence and discrimination.

This evaluation does not attempt to evaluate *all* GDP activities across *all* countries, as each individual project and component of the GDP will be evaluated separately in due course. Instead, this evaluation provides higher-level analysis. While utmost effort has been taken by the research team to ensure that the evaluation captures the complete range of experiences and feedback from all partners, limited time and geographical research coverage in each site limited the ability to engage with all grantee organizations/CSO partners representing the full diversity of beneficiaries.

1.2 EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation is based on the following two key questions and several sub questions.

1. How effective has the LGBTI GDP been?

- a. What are the core elements of effective GDP support?
- b. To what extent has the GDP facilitated organizational change?⁸
- c. How has the GDP increased capacity and changed approaches to capacity-building for LGBTI individuals and CSOs?
- d. How has the GDP enhanced coordination between/among implementing/donor partners? Has the GDP helped create and sustain linkages between LGBTI advocacy groups and organizations?
- e. How effective have the GDP's efforts been in leveraging additional resources, linkages, partnerships, and opportunities with and among implementing and donor partners, advocacy groups, and other organizations?
- f. In what ways has GDP support helped LGBTI organizations overcome challenges in pursuing their objectives? Have beneficiaries experienced any challenges in accessing / utilizing GDP support?
- g. What are the areas of improvement for effective GDP support?

2. What is the impact of the LGBTI GDP on beneficiaries?

⁸ Although this was not an evaluation question in our scope of work, we have included it to present the richness of information and feedback obtained during the evaluation.

- a. What have been the effects of GDP interventions (i.e., grants, trainings, research, communications labs, and economic empowerment work) on beneficiaries and their communities? In particular:
 - i. What have been the most significant changes for groups within the LGBTI community (from the perspective of project beneficiaries and implementing/resource partners) as a result of the GDP? Have there been any unintended/unexpected results?
 - ii. Has the GDP increased economic, political, social, individual and/or collective empowerment within the LGBTI community? If so, how? Have lesbian women, gay men, bisexual people, transgender women/men, and intersex individuals been equally empowered?
 - iii. As a result of the GDP, to what extent do beneficiaries (both individuals and groups) feel more empowered to advocate on their own behalf?
 - iv. To what extent have beneficiaries (both individuals and organizations) been able to leverage the resources provided by the GDP to expand their networks? To obtain further resources?
- b. Which trainings provided by the GDP have been most useful? What challenges have been encountered? Which trainings could be improved, and how?
- c. How effective have the Media, Communications, and Technology Labs (CommsLabs) been in strengthening advocacy in focus countries?
- d. What is the value of the GDP's research activities (i.e., landscape analyses, the global research report on the relationship between LGBT inclusion and economic development)? How have the research products been used?
- e. Have beneficiary organizations supported individuals across the LGBTI spectrum? To what extent? Why or why not? What were the challenges with providing this support?

1.3 EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHOD

This evaluation is comprised of three parts: document reviews, key informant interviews (KII) with participants at all levels (1 - donor, 2 - implementing partner, 3 - grantee

organization/CSO partner, and 4 - end beneficiary), and the identification of beneficiary impact stories (using the “Most Significant Change” (MSC) methodology⁹).

First, NORC reviewed GDP documents made available by USAID and implementing partners. Next, three sites were chosen for in-person data collection: Colombia, Serbia, and South Africa. NORC then interviewed a total of 65 individuals (3 donor staff, 9 implementing partner staff, 34 grantee organization/CSO partner staff, and 19 end beneficiaries) in Colombia, Serbia, South Africa, Sweden, and the United States. Finally, NORC executed the MSC methodology. NORC’s Gender Expert and Senior LGBTI/Gender Expert trained grantee organization staff in Colombia in the MSC method of story collection. In total seven individuals from seven organizations were trained in the MSC technique and together they worked with beneficiaries to develop 35 MSC stories to document the GDP’s impact.

To ensure the safety and security of the end beneficiaries, the evaluation team, in close consultation with donor and implementing partner staff, decided to *not* include any full MSC stories (which often contain personal and sensitive information) in this evaluation document. Instead, anonymized quotes and segments of representative MSC stories are included throughout this document to illustrate the impacts of the GDP.

2.0 PROGRAM CONTEXT AND OBJECTIVES

2.1 PROGRAM CONTEXT

LGBTI people exist in every country and are part of every society. LGBTI people face harsh realities in many parts of the world, including the vast majority of developing countries. Criminalization and stigma drive high rates of anti-LGBTI violence and discrimination. Globally, over 70 countries criminalize same sex acts, with punishments that can include imprisonment and the death penalty. In many developing countries there is a lack of legal gender recognition, and the state-sanctioned non-consensual medical interventions on intersex persons. Extremely high anti-LGBTI stigma levels have been documented, and targeted anti-LGBTI violence can be life-threatening. In addition, LGBTI people face discrimination in access to services and exclusion from development programs; there is extensive documentation of anti-LGBTI discrimination

⁹ MSC is a qualitative participatory monitoring and evaluation tool that records the impact of a program through the collection of stories from organizations and beneficiaries in the field by asking them to explain the “most significant change” experienced as a result of the project.

and exclusion in access to disaster relief, education, employment, health, and humanitarian assistance.

2.2 PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The two GDAs¹⁰ of the GDP take a multidimensional approach to addressing the violence, discrimination, and social exclusion faced by LGBTI people in developing countries. These approaches, outlined below, have made many accomplishments in developing LGBTI leaders, providing insights into the contextual differences of LGBTI experiences, and engaging allies in protecting LGBTI people from violence and discrimination.

GDA 1: The Global LGBTI Human Rights Partnership (2012-2018) aims to build the capacity of LGBTI leaders and CSOs through grants, training, and research designed to inform policy. This project has several implementing partners. The lead implementing partner is the Astraea Lesbian Foundation for Justice (Astraea). Sub-partners are the LGBTQ Victory Institute (Victory Institute) and the Williams Institute. RFSL, an implementing partner of Sida, ran a parallel program that carefully coordinated with this arm of the GDP.¹¹

Grantmaking

Under the GDP, Astraea has provided grants totaling over \$3 million to 65 LGBTI CSOs in 12 countries. These grants (over 85% of which were leveraged funds¹² – i.e., funds not from USAID or Sida) have played a critical role in strengthening the capacity of LGBTI leaders and CSOs. This support has enabled CSOs to address violence and discrimination in the countries in which they operate. This includes increasing access to non-discriminatory services in health care and the legal system, national policy reform, legal protections, increasing civic engagement, shifting public attitudes through media, and creating civil society partnerships to ensure equal inclusion for LGBTI communities.

Research

The GDP's activities are informed by realities on the ground, which are changing constantly. Astraea, The Victory Institute, and The Williams Institute conduct research

¹⁰ GDAs are USAID mechanisms for public-private partnerships. Each of the GDAs in the GDP are 1) funded by USAID, Sida, and third party organizations ("leverage partners"), and 2) co-managed by USAID and Sida.

¹¹ "Rainbow Leaders," the Sida-funded program implemented by RFSL, trained 120 global LGBTI advocates in organizational leadership, management, and fundraising. This program was evaluated separately; the report is available [here](#).

¹² Implementing partners are required to leverage USAID's funds with third-party contributions at a minimum 1:1 ratio.

on the realities for LGBTI individuals in focus countries to inform national, regional, and global policy and programs. Astraea leads efforts in producing landscape analyses, which provide country context and guidance for in-country engagement, programming, and grantmaking. These landscape analyses have been completed in each focus country. Astraea also published a case study entitled, *Bridges to Justice: Case Study of LGBTI Rights in Nepal*, which examines the important strides the LGBTI movement has made in Nepal.

The Victory Institute produces reports that demonstrate the impact of LGBTI democratic participation, and the impact of LGBTI leaders in elected office. These publications explore the challenges LGBTI leaders face when running for public office, recommendations on increasing political participation in focus countries, and the positive impacts on societies that actively engage LGBTI elected officials. To date, The Victory Institute has produced 17 research publications about LGBTI political participation in Latin America and around the globe, often engaging LGBTI CSOs in this work.

The Williams Institute is a multi-disciplinary academic center at the University of California at Los Angeles, a world-renowned research university. Among other activities, the Williams Institute produces academic publications intended for a wide audience on the impact on social and economic discrimination against LGBTI individuals. This includes a groundbreaking study entitled *The Relationship between LGBTI Inclusion and Economic Development: An Analysis of Emerging Economies*. This study outlines how the social exclusion of LGBTI individuals can have adverse effects on a country's economic development. This study is particularly relevant to the work of the GDP as many of the GDP's focus countries have high rates of human rights violations against LGBTI individuals and communities. This study has garnered significant attention by policymakers and stakeholders, and has sparked new research on the connections between LGBTI inclusion/well-being and economic development.

CommsLabs

Astraea leads the implementation of CommsLabs. CommsLabs is a movement-building initiative that aims to provide LGBTI leaders with the skills and knowledge needed to securely organize and advocate using media and in online spaces. While online advocacy is an effective tool in many spheres, it can create challenges and safety issues for LGBTI leaders in developing countries, where open expression and advocacy can be met with resistance or harm. As such, CommsLabs ensures that leaders are equipped to create safe online spaces, build networks, and exchange information securely within a global network of leaders and technologists. To date, there have been three CommsLabs in Colombia (2014), Kenya (2015), and South Africa (2016). Astraea takes a very participatory approach to each CommsLabs training, and incorporates

three unique elements into each: adaptability, leader-informed activities, and holistic healing and wellness. First, the adaptive element of CommsLabs puts the unique political and technological infrastructure characteristics of each context at the center of the training. This ensures that CommsLabs trainings remain relevant to the changing realities in each environment. Further, the evolving nature of technology and digital communications platforms necessitates an approach that allows for continuous learning and flexibility. Next, the leader-informed element of CommsLabs puts LGBTI leaders as the drivers of CommsLabs structure, and priorities. This ensures that LGBTI leaders have a strong sense of ownership of each activity and skill gained, which enables LGBTI leaders to serve as agents of sustainable change in their organizations and communities. Lastly, the holistic healing and wellness element of CommsLabs provides leaders with dedicated time to discuss organizational and personal wellness.

Democratic Participation Training

As of 2017 The Victory Institute has trained more than 220 LGBTI leaders in Europe/Eurasia, Latin America and the Caribbean, South Asia, and sub-Saharan Africa in democratic participation.¹³ These trainings, always in collaboration with CSOs, are designed to equip LGBTI leaders with the knowledge and skills necessary to participate effectively in their democracies, either engaging political parties and state institutions as civil society leaders, or running for office as openly LGBTI candidates, depending on the socio-political context. Following such trainings, consistent positive outcomes have been achieved in focus countries. Six openly LGBTI leaders were newly elected in Colombia in 2015; three had been previous trainees and Victory Institute and their local partner worked closely with another through his campaign (he later attended an elected officials training). One trainee in the Western Balkans was appointed as head of the national government's advisory committee for the LGBTI community. Lastly, during the 2017 general elections in Honduras, six candidates ran as openly LGBTI, all of whom were Victory Institute trainees. Their campaigns brought positive visibility to LGBTI political issues. The trained leaders also represent groups within the LGBTI community, including racial/ethnic minorities, cisgender women, and transgender men and women. These trainings are reinforced by the organization of forums and campaigns, which allow trainees to apply what they have learned to engage political parties and civil society members in the inclusion of LGBTI rights within political agendas.

GDA 2: Promoting Global LGBTI Equality through Entrepreneurship & Small- and Medium-sized Enterprise Growth in Developing Countries and Regions (2013 – 2020) is a project that aims to promote LGBTI economic empowerment as well as inclusive economic growth for LGBTI people and businesses owners in developing

¹³ Confidential handout of the GDP overview provided to the evaluation team.

countries through the establishment of LGBTI chambers of commerce, the provision of trainings and networking opportunities for LGBTI business owners, and the implementation of LGBTI supplier diversity initiatives. The implementing partner is the National LGBT Chamber of Commerce (NGLCC). To date, the NGLCC has established LGBTI chambers of commerce in six countries, trained more than 2,175 LGBTI businesses and entrepreneurs, and registered over 80 LGBTI businesses in an international supplier registry.¹⁴ In Colombia and Mexico, NGLCC has established an initiative entitled “Talento Diverso,” which aims to combat labor market discrimination, help LGBTI individuals build employment skills, and develop a database of talented LGBTI workers for inclusive businesses to use as a hiring pool. The LGBTI Chamber of Commerce in Colombia has successfully established a “Friendly Biz” certification program, which provides trainings for businesses on building inclusivity for LGBTI individuals. In the Dominican Republic, political leaders are working in consultation with the local LGBTI Chamber of Commerce to identify ways to improve social and economic empowerment of the intersex community. Additionally, chambers of commerce supported by the GDP provide mentorship opportunities to LGBTI business owners, and provide training around identifying entry points, processes around registering, working with multinational corporations, and establishing business-to-business connections. These accomplishments have facilitated the establishment and success of LGBTI businesses, facilitated inclusive working environments for LGBTI individuals, and ensured that LGBTI individuals are better equipped to achieve better economic outcomes.

3.0 EVALUATION METHODS AND LIMITATIONS

To gather the data required for this performance evaluation, NORC used a mix of mutually reinforcing qualitative methods¹⁵ that reflect the program objectives, research questions being addressed, and indicators. We combined the results of each technique to capture the diversity of perceptions of beneficiaries, grantee organizations, and implementing partners about their experiences within the GDP, and with organizations supported by the GDP. The qualitative analysis, which involves key informant interviews

¹⁴ Confidential handout of the GDP overview provided to the evaluation team.

¹⁵ Quantitative data on LGBTI populations in developing countries is often scarce, and when it is available it is often incomplete. This is often due to 1) limited inclusion of LGBTI issues in broader quantitative data gathering efforts, 2) limited funding for LGBTI specific quantitative data gathering efforts, and 3) fears (often related to personal safety and security) associated with identifying as LGBTI / highlighting LGBTI issues in existing data collection efforts (particularly in countries with high anti-LGBTI discrimination, violence, and stigma). As such, there is not currently a quantitative baseline against which results can be compared.

(KIs), group interviews, and Most Significant Change (MSC) stories, provides local context and concrete examples of the activities supported by the GDP. A total of 65 individuals were interviewed for the evaluation (3 donor staff, 9 implementing partner staff, 34 grantee organization/CSO partner staff, and 19 end beneficiaries) and seven individuals from seven organizations were trained in the MSC technique and developed MSC stories to document the impacts of the GDP on end beneficiaries.

NORC's Evaluation Team conducted the performance evaluation in a participatory manner, which involved engaging USAID and Sida, implementing partners, and grantee organizations/CSO partner in the development of evaluation instruments, suggestion of key stakeholders for interviews, and feedback on MSC stories.

3.1 EVALUATION MANAGEMENT

The evaluation team included Ritu Nayyar-Stone (Project Director), Piotr Pawlak (Senior LGBTI/Gender Expert), and Letitia Onyango (Gender Expert). Seven representatives of grantee organizations in Latin America were also part of the evaluation, as they conducted interviews with their beneficiaries for the MSC stories. The evaluation team was also supported by two interpreters who assisted in the MSC training and translation of training materials and qualitative data.

3.2 STUDY DESIGN

In order to maintain the GDP's confidentiality standards (which are in place due to safety and security considerations), NORC worked closely with USAID and implementing partners to coordinate training and data collection activities.

This evaluation is comprised of three parts: document review, KIs (in-person and remote), and MSC stories. First, NORC reviewed GDP documents made available by USAID and implementing partners. These documents were instrumental in selecting interviewees and the identification of trainees for the MSC method. Next, three sites were chosen for in-person data collection: Colombia, Serbia, and South Africa. In each country, NORC's Senior LGBTI/Gender Expert conducted in-person key informant interviews (KIs) with several organizations and beneficiaries. NORC drafted and finalized the interview protocols, and shared them with USAID and implementing partners. These interviews were designed to capture each organization's perceptions of the GDP, including its efficacy, benefits of participation, and potential improvements. KIs were summarized through notes. The findings from these interviews were analyzed along thematic lines, paying close attention to themes around the efficacy of the GDP.

Colombia was selected as the site for training beneficiaries on the MSC technique. NORC trained one representative from four grantee organizations in Colombia, and one organization each from Peru, Honduras, and the Dominican Republic in the MSC

method. This training was administered by NORC's Senior LGBTI/Gender Expert and NORC's Gender Expert.

MSC is a qualitative participatory monitoring and evaluation tool that records the impact of a program through the collection of stories from the field. At the field level, program staff and stakeholders collect story data, which is subsequently analyzed and reviewed to assess areas in which the program had the most impact (Davis and Dart 2005). The use of the MSC method in this evaluation is an integral part of identifying key areas of impact for grantees organizations/CSO partners and end beneficiaries. Due to the nature of the GDP, interventions in each country have varied, which complicates efforts to make systematic comparisons across countries. Consequently, the MSC technique was chosen to help collect program impact data and establish monitoring and data collection strategies that grantee organizations can use in the future.

After receiving training from NORC on MSC, grantee organization staff worked closely with their beneficiaries and other stakeholders to qualitatively assess and select stories. NORC served as a remote coordinator for the story collection database and provided remote support and facilitation for the field staff as the stories were collected. NORC also conducted a second trip to Colombia to work closely with trained organizational staff to further refine and select the stories that showed the impacts of the GDP - and use this technique as a monitoring tool. Due to the sensitive nature of the stories and at times highly visible profile of the beneficiaries who shared their MSC experience, no stories are shared in their entirety for this report. However, the findings from the MSC stories inform the evaluation findings and we use anonymized quotes and text boxes throughout the evaluation to illustrate key findings.

3.3 INTERVIEWS

KIIs were conducted September – December 2017, with three additional clarifying interviews conducted in April 2018. These involved donor staff, implementing partner staff, grantee organization/CSO partner staff, and project beneficiaries. All notes from these interviews were summarized by the Senior LGBTI/Gender expert.

3.4 SITE SELECTION

The selection of locations for key informant interviews and MSC story collection were largely determined by levels activity in each area. In consultation with donors and implementing partners, Colombia was selected as the location for training for the MSC method, with four representatives from Colombia, and one each from Peru, Honduras, and the Dominican Republic. Serbia and South Africa were selected for site visits since multiple interventions occurred in each country.

3.5 LIMITATIONS

The Evaluation Team encountered some limitations inherent to the design of this evaluation and during field periods. Some of the more relevant limitations are listed below:

Field-based data collection: While utmost effort has been undertaken by the research team to ensure it captures a range of feedback from donor and implementing partners, limited time and geographical research coverage in each site did not allow for the analysis to include the full representation of grantee organizations or the full diversity of LGBTI beneficiary groups. Further, given time/geography constraints, it was not possible to interview representatives from some groups, such as intersex people. Moreover, while the interviews documented experiences of diverse donor and implementing partners, staff turnover was a factor in the type and quality of information collected. As such, the presented conclusions are broadly representative but may not fully reflect the experiences of the entire GDP network. For these and other reasons, we acknowledge that it is possible that the evaluation may not give a fully comprehensive picture of efficacy of the GDP; the experiences of donors, implementing partners, and grantee organizations/LGBTI CSOs; and potential areas of improvement.

MSC Story Collection and Use: Due to the many activities of grantee organizations, the story collection period proved to be shorter than ideal. Consequently, many stories were sent to NORC very close to the end of the collection period, which made it difficult to provide real-time feedback of each story, and provide remote support for story collection and write-up as originally intended.

As mentioned above, to ensure the safety and security of the end beneficiaries, the evaluation team, in close consultation with donor and implementing partner staff, decided to *not* include any full MSC stories (which often contain personal and sensitive information) in this evaluation document. Instead, anonymized quotes and segments of representative MSC stories are included throughout this document to illustrate the impacts of the GDP.

4.0 FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS BY KEY EVALUATION QUESTION

4.1 CENTRAL QUESTION: HOW EFFECTIVE HAS THE GDP BEEN?

The GDP's main accomplishments include the following:

- Provided grants totaling over \$3 million (over 85% of which were leveraged funds¹⁶ – i.e., funds not from USAID or Sida) to 65 LGBTI CSOs in 12 countries that strengthened the capacity of LGBTI leaders and CSOs to address violence and discrimination;
- Established and facilitated capacity building trainings, including
 - Three Media, Communications, and Technology Labs (CommsLabs) that brought together LGBTI people and technologists to identify tools that can support/protect LGBTI advocates;
 - Training 229 LGBTI leaders across all four of the GDP's focus regions in democratic participation;
- Conducted and published ground-breaking research designed to inform policy, including
 - Ten landscape analyses documenting the social, political, and economic conditions for LGBTI people in ten countries and one sub-region (including recommendations for allies, advocates, and funders);
 - 17 research publications about LGBTI political participation in developing countries;
 - *The Relationship between LGBT Inclusion and Economic Development: An Analysis of Emerging Economies*¹⁷ – a groundbreaking study that showed a positive correlation between LGBTI inclusion and gross domestic product per capita;
- Supported enhanced economic opportunities for LGBTI people, including
 - Established/supported LGBTI Chambers of Commerce/Business Organizations in six countries;
 - Trained and provided networking opportunities for over 2,175 LGBTI entrepreneurs and businesses; and
 - Registered over 80 LGBTI-owned businesses in an international supplier registry, building an international approach to supplier diversity.

This evaluation found that the GDP has been very effective in achieving its goals, and that the composition and structure of the GDP was a driving factor for its efficacy. The multi-partner structure of the GDP promoted positive changes within donor partners, implementing partners, and grantee organizations/CSO partners including internal

¹⁶ Implementing partners are required to leverage USAID's funds with third-party contributions (i.e., from corporations, private foundations) at a minimum 1:1 ratio.

¹⁷ Badgett, M., Nezhad, S., Waaldijk, K., & van der Meulen Rodgers, Y. (2014). *The Relationship between LGBT Inclusion and Economic Development: An Analysis of Emerging Economies*. UCLA: The Williams Institute. It is available [here](#).

growth, expansion of programs, improved management systems, and broad expansion of existing networks.

The evaluation concludes that the 1) small grants to LGBTI CSOs were effectively used to help advance protections from violence and discrimination; 2) trainings have significantly strengthened the capacities and abilities of LGBTI people and organizations advocate for their own human rights and improve their lives; 3) research and analysis produced under the GDP have been used by broad range of stakeholders to inform in-country programming and raise awareness of the harsh realities faced by LGBTI people in developing countries, as well as to increase understanding of the connections between LGBTI inclusion and economic development; and 4) economic empowerment initiatives have provided LGBTI individuals in developing countries with networks, skills, and resources to advance economically despite the stigma and discrimination they face.

This evaluation also found that the GDP had distinct and positive impacts for grantee organizations/CSO partners and implementing partner organizations. For grantee organizations/CSO partners, the GDP was instrumental in addressing specific vulnerabilities (i.e., violence, discrimination) across LGBTI groups, and promoting the effective and sustainable use of financial resources. Further trainings supported by the GDP helped grantee organizations and individual beneficiaries expand valuable skills in organizational leadership, democratic participation, and digital safety/advocacy. For implementing partners, the GDP improved their financial sustainability through resource mobilization and leveraging new funding. These findings indicate that the collaborative, coordinated efforts of the GDP are critical to continued efforts to protect LGBTI people in developing countries from violence and discrimination.

4.1.1 What are the core elements of effective GDP support?

The evaluation sought to determine the core elements of effective GDP support. In order to find out, we asked respondents what elements of the GDP they found positive, unique, creative, innovative, and outside of the traditional realm of international partnerships compared to any other partnership they are or were part of. We asked respondents to identify the most effective characteristics of the GDP, as well as areas that were challenging or did not work as well.

The evaluation identified seven effective core elements:

1. Composition and Structure
2. Partners
3. Coordination
4. Leadership
5. Funding Strategy

- 6. Multidisciplinary Approach
- 7. LGBTI-focused

Core Element I: *Composition and Structure*, the government-led, multi-partner, multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral, private-public character of the GDP.

There are numerous examples of successful global partnerships, and indeed, much of the GDP's success is attributed to its collaborative multi-partner, multi-sector character, and its extensive geographical coverage. It is a first-of-its-kind public-private partnership, which leveraged the financial and technical contributions of corporations, bilateral donors, foundations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and universities to support LGBTI human rights and development in 14 countries across four regions. All of the KII respondents within this evaluation acknowledged that multilayered, multi-partner structure of the GDP to be unique in local, regional, and global efforts to support and empower LGBTI individuals and CSOs.

“Working with the government partner was a unique experience for us. It was our first time to directly engage with USAID. It placed us in a unique position as a grant making institution.” – Program manager, implementing partner¹⁸

The evaluation also assessed the extent to which the GDP enabled coordination and cooperation among and with other partners. We found that the government-led, multi-partner, multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral, private-public character of the GDP allowed for coordination across a broad swath of domestic and international stakeholders. This is perhaps best captured by one of the key informants interviewed who explained:

“The kind of actors that were brought together was unique and empowering. We expanded our capacity because of that. We have good results [and] we can now apply for more funding. The GDP motivated us to do more, expanded our expertise, and strengthened our capacity” – Project manager, implementing partner

In addition, the collective experience of the implementing partners and the grantee organizations/CSO partners interviewed suggests that the GDP's organizational structure ensured a high degree of commitment, communication, and accountability among all partners through specific characteristics: a common yet broad enough

¹⁸ KIIs and MSC story gathering efforts were conducted aligned with GDP's confidentiality standards (based on safety and security considerations). As such, quotations in this evaluation have been anonymized. To help the reader understand the position of the speaker, the type of organization/individual represented by the quotation is listed (i.e., 1 – donor, 2 – implementing partner, 3 – grantee organization/CSO partner, 4 – end beneficiary).

agenda to accommodate diverse organizational missions and visions; mutually reinforcing activities; long-term financial commitment; continuous communication; and the presence of ‘backbone’ partners.

The bilateral donor character of the GDP was also found to be unique and effective. The interviews suggested that the GDP gave USAID and Sida a unique opportunity to closely work together. It expanded access to each other’s resources/networks and provided opportunities for efficient support and learning. For several of the key informants interviewed, the combination of private-public stakeholders involved, and the collaboration with non-traditional partners (i.e., chambers of commerce, organizations focused on building LGBTI capacity in political leadership) was an innovative and unique approach and experience.

Furthermore, this evaluation revealed that implementing partners and grantee organizations in Colombia, Serbia, and South Africa found the government-led character of the GDP to be a unique and effective model in engaging local stakeholders, particularly state and local governments, in addressing the issues faced by LGBTI people in developing countries. We found it to be particularly true in settings where authorities paid little to no attention to the vulnerabilities of LGBTI individuals.

“The Branding has been helpful. Having the USAID logo on our studies is beneficial. It certainly added a sense of legitimacy to our work.” – Staff member, implementing partner

We found the USAID and Sida governmental branding of the GDP, including on publications, documents, and audio-visual materials, was helpful in establishing collaborative working relationships with other stakeholders or accessing collaboration and funding opportunities that advance LGBTI rights with international governments, multilaterals, and other non-governmental organizations.¹⁹ For several local grantee organizations interviewed, working on LGBTI issues with support from USAID and Sida led to positive reactions and subsequent buy-in from local governments. Similar observations were noted in interviews with several of the implementing partners. As an implementing partner staff member states: *“You are able to get things done by having backing of the government. This approach needs to be replicated.”* Conversely, one implementing partner pointed out that the option to not use the branding was also valuable for organizations in hostile working environments. This flexibility was significant

¹⁹ Some organizations (particularly grantee organizations/CSO partners in developing countries) felt using the USAID and Sida could have a negative implication on their safety, security, and ability to participate in the GDP. As such, having the opportunity to deploy a branding exemption proved effective.

in ensuring that grantee organizations/CSO partners were able to implement approaches that suited their own needs.

For one implementing partner, USAID backing served as a magnet for additional funding opportunities. The association with USAID helped this implementing partner better engage the private sector and led to increased corporate interest in funding efforts to protect LGBTI people from violence and discrimination. This in turn, created funding that allowed grantee organizations/CSO partners supported by this implementing partner to employ their own strategies for private sector engagement on the ground. The success of this approach eventually enabled these grantee organizations/CSO partners to become self-sustaining.

Core Element II: *Partners*, strategic choice of ‘backbone organizations’: the role of resource and implementing partners.

A unique element of the GDP was that from the beginning it engaged ‘backbone organizations’ - organizations that were already experts and well-networked in the field of LGBTI protections and rights - to define and achieve its desirable outcomes and results. This leadership model is distinctly different from more common leadership models.

Sida’s role was crucial to the success of the GDP. At the donor level, Sida provided unique contributions and served as a strategic co-leader, due to its institutional commitments to the advancement of the human rights of LGBTI people, extensive prior expertise in issues related to sexual orientation and gender identity/expression (SOGIE), and global recognition as expert in advancing gender equality globally. In addition to direct financial support and co-management of the two GDAs, Sida’s contribution included direct funding to and management of the implementing partner RFSL, which implemented the Rainbow Leaders Program. For USAID, working with Sida was a strategic choice as Sida was a long-standing partner and was entering into a broader agreement with USAID, giving the GDP visibility under a larger umbrella of bilateral collaboration.

“It was crucial to have another governmental partner on this.” – Staff member, donor partner

Another interviewee stated that the bilateral collaboration was also important and significant to Sida. The choice to enter the GDP was strategic as it allowed the agency to further strengthen its mission and strategic objectives and put into action its commitment to advance and protect LGBTI rights.

“The timing was great. There was global momentum to address LGBT rights. It was strategic to be part of the effort.” – Staff member, donor partner

The evaluation found the engagement of experienced implementing partners to be distinctive. Their rich expertise, shared values, efficient resource use, and long-term commitment to advancing the rights and protections of LGBTI people were critical to the achievements of the GDP’s objectives. Each implementing partner served as a solid foundation for the activities implemented by their partners and grantee organizations. Furthermore, the contextualized guidance, high responsiveness, and extensive support from implementing partners enabled grantee organizations to increase activity inputs and reach program goals.

This holistic approach to partnership, including regular collaboration between implementing partner staff and grantee organization/CSO partner staff, led to maximum impact of activities aimed to support and empower LGBTI individuals. For instance, in Colombia, technical support, organizational mentorship, and guidance from a program officer at the implementing partner level helped a small grantee organization successfully register as an NGO.

Core Element III: *Coordination*, provision of support through regular and personalized communication.

At the donor and implementing partner level, a strong feature of the GDP was the ongoing coordination and regular convening, which helped to build trust among partners, achieve goals, improve collaboration, share agendas and visions, and highlight best practices and lessons learned. For instance:

- According to several KIIs, the annual all partners meetings held in Washington, DC proved to be a useful opportunity for all partners to learn about the work that was being done under the GDP as a whole and create opportunities for increased synergy and coordination.

Furthermore, regular communication between implementing partners and grantee organizations/CSO partners (through regular virtual meetings and check-ins, in-person meetings, and recurring reporting) established a sense of trust and overall coordination, and facilitated organizational development for many of them. For instance:

- Several other grantee organizations in Colombia, Serbia, and South Africa indicated that specific opportunities were communicated through connections made in the GDP such as international conferences and symposia, training, or funding opportunities. In some instances, staff of these organizations were able to attend international conferences.

“For us it was [valuable to have] the very personal relationship we have with [the implementing partner] and the ‘human touch’ that is always present in our partnership with them. We receive personal attention from the program officer and can always call them up when needed.” - Staff member, grantee organization, Serbia

Core Element IV: *Leadership*, a designated ‘champion’ on board who facilitates change.

USAID’s LGBTI Senior Advisor played an important role in establishing and maintaining channels of communication between all partners of the GDP, particularly between donor and implementing partner organizations. Described by many implementing partner staff as a “driving force behind the GDP,” he became a primary point of contact and activity manager for the GDP with strong personal interest, commitment, and determination in ensuring desirable impacts, within and outside the agency. The role of the LGBTI Senior Advisor in coordinating processes among the GDP implementing partners and many of the grantee organizations/CSO partners has been substantial. Some key informants interviewed suggested that even more could have been achieved if the LGBTI Senior Advisor had a designated and permanent team of staff members.

Core Element V: *Funding Strategy*, grant-making approach based on the premise of flexibility, and long-term investment including in the organizational development and leadership strengthening.

The GDP’s grant-making strategy was aligned with Astraea’s longstanding approach to provide long-term funding to grantee organizations. The expansion of these long-term grants under the GDP presented an opportunity for the organizations to focus on the long-term support and empowerment needed for LGBTI individuals and CSOs as they advocate for their own human rights and seek to improve their lives.

“We were able to focus on the process of empowering LGBTI individuals.” - Executive Director, Grantee Organization, Serbia

The challenges and complexities of supporting and empowering LGBTI individuals and CSOs call for a strategic approach that facilitates flexible funding. It follows that a highly integrated and structured investment in organizational development and leadership strengthening among grantee organizations is necessary to ensure development and delivery efficiencies and to reduce long-term costs. We found that the flexible character of the GDP grants provided an opportunity to address unplanned or unforeseen circumstances (emergency, short, medium as well as long-term needs or vulnerabilities of the LGBTI individuals) either by addressing unforeseen circumstances (in addition to

specific program outcomes) or by contextualizing and revising program outcomes to best fit the needs and expectations of the beneficiaries. For instance:

- In Serbia, a grantee organization was able to use part of the GDP funding to cover costs related to providing psychological counselling to one of the beneficiaries in need.
- In South Africa, a grantee organization was able to cover shelter related expenses for one of its beneficiaries suffering unemployment due to stigma and discrimination on the basis of SOGIE.

“We know what the support will look like for the next year, two or more, and thus, we are able to plan accordingly for our activities. This also reduces organizational stress related to financial coverage for planned activities” - Executive Director, grantee organization, Serbia

The evaluation found the opportunity to adjust the way organizations implemented, tracked, and measured results. As a whole, the GDP operated in many different environments, in diverse political, socio-economic, and cultural settings with varying capabilities for data collection. As such, a one size-fits-all approach to the evaluation of individual implementing partner and grantee organizations’ programs would have likely failed. We found that the GDP, when needed, has taken into account the diverse context of the work, the different challenges and evolving circumstances of the settings where the program implementation took place, and allowed adjustments in the way organizations implemented their activities and then tracked and measured results.

“In comparison to other USAID programs or partnerships, the GDP was unique in the sense it allowed for flexibility - opportunity to change, or to adjust some of the approaches, strategies and goals of individual activities and programs. We had portfolio of countries and started one by one implementation of our activities. We started in Latin America first, in three countries of similar context and facing similar challenges. Then, we moved onto other regions, the Caribbean, Africa, and Asia and realized that we need different indicators to track our results. The GDP allowed us to do so.” – Staff member, implementing partner

Core Element VI: *Multidisciplinary approach*, a combination of different disciplines and the diverse perspectives maximize outcomes.

Funding agencies traditionally frame their funding around single issues, use one particular framework or approach, and often support activities carried out by individual organizations and researchers, rather than encouraging or requiring collaboration and

information exchange.²⁰ The evaluation found that the multidisciplinary character of the GDP – the combination of trainings, capacity building, research efforts, advancement of LGBTI entrepreneurship and business development, and other specific activities – created and offered a holistic and comprehensive approach and mechanism for the advancement of LGBTI rights in developing countries. According to one implementing partner, *“the unique character of the GDP is that it supported a diversity of efforts.”* Particularly, the evaluation found that the recognition and focus on the role of media and technology in efforts to support and empower LGBTI individuals and organizations has been an important element of the GDP’s interventions. The GDP’s investment in communication and technology capacity for LGBTI people in developing countries is distinctive. According to several key informants, the long-term positive outcomes are visible and continue to create opportunities for positive change.

The multidisciplinary character of the GDP also implies the combination of human capital and human rights-based approaches to LGBTI advocacy and development. SOGIE programs are gaining momentum as donors have become increasingly aware of the harsh realities facing LGBTI people in developing countries, and the connections between LGBTI inclusion/well-being and economic development. However, what differentiates the GDP from any other global efforts is the application of both the human rights-based approach in relation to LGBTI persons and the human capital approach to support and empower LGBTI individuals and organizations. To this end, we found that investing in a multi-angle approach – a set of economic development, organizational leadership, political participation, academic research, and advocacy activities – is a core element in providing effective support and empowerment of LGBTI individuals and organizations.

“The important element about GDP is that it is a first of its kind LGBTI-focused partnership developed using not only the human rights framework. The GDP has been about the protection and advancement of LGBTI rights but also about economic empowerment of LGBTI individuals” – Program manager, implementing partner

Core Element VII: *LGBTI-focused*, exclusive concentration on LGBTI key population and a diversity of inputs and outputs.

Bilateral agreements have been a long-standing part of development across regions. However, the GDP has been a first-of-its-kind bilateral partnership focused solely on the advancement of LGBTI rights globally.

²⁰Thompson K. Collective impact: funder, heal thyself. Stanford Social Innovation Review. 2014; 8.

“We never had a global LGBTI partnership before that exclusively addressed the lived realities of LGBTI individuals in developing countries. The fact that we mobilized expertise, money, and logistics on the issue is groundbreaking.” – Project manager, donor partner

We found that the GDP helped donor partners, implementing partners, and grantee organizations/CSO partners strengthen and support their agenda or mission to help protect LGBTI people in developing countries from violence and discrimination. One donor partner noted that the GDP helped to elevate the agenda as well as the issues faced by LGBTI individuals within their agency. The interview concluded that the GDP demonstrates that the protection of LGBTI people in developing countries from violence and discrimination is possible if it is done right. It shows that bilateral donors can play a role in supporting and empowering LGBTI individuals and organizations as part of its commitment to development. Another donor partner key informant indicated that the GDP contributed to higher awareness among staff members of the importance and need for similar initiatives, which should be focused not only on results but on creating long-lasting political and development commitment to the human rights of LGBTI people.

4.1.2 To what extent has the GDP facilitated organizational change?

The GDP has helped several implementing partner organizations become more internationally focused.

For several implementing partner organizations, the GDP significantly helped to expand their role internationally and increased their ability to reach LGBTI movements beyond their initial geographical coverage. For one implementing partner, the GDP helped to expand its existing activity portfolio to two new regions, namely Latin America and the Western Balkans. Similarly, another implementing partner achieved striking results in equipping hundreds of multi-cultural, multi-national members of global LGBTI movements with new knowledge, abilities, and leadership skills.

For other implementing partners, the GDP was essential in building existing global presence, international programming, global representation, and affiliates in several continents. As a result, one implementing partner started working around the world, increased the number of staff members focused on the international portfolio, and attracted and developed working relationships with a significant number of partners from outside the United States. This includes high-level private sector partners and management representatives of international for-profit corporations, business ventures, and entrepreneurs in the banking, hospitality, and consulting sectors. For another implementing partner, the GDP was a stimulating factor to enhance already existing internal-focused strategic objectives. At the time of the launch of the GDP, this

implementing partner had already mapped strategic plans to engage in international work. The GDP allowed that implementing partner to do so.

The GDP triggered internal growth and change that led to the expansion of programs and targets, change in organizational structure, and/or strengthening of management mechanisms and approaches.

All of the interviewed partners - at the donor and implementing partner level as well as at the grantee organization/CSO partner level - have highlighted internal growth, and in some cases, organizational change as one of the most important effects the GDP had on their organization's ability to pursue its objectives and overcome emerging challenges. Some referred to the growth in the scope, coverage, and diversity of programs. Others referred to revisions and improvements to internal mechanisms including reporting as well as monitoring and evaluation (M&E), or reflection on strategic goals, objectives, and organizational values. For some GDP partners, the growth meant higher-level strategic reflection or organizational development, while for others it meant actual expansion of programs or activities, revisions to its mission, and/or hiring of new staff.

At the donor partner level, we found that the GDP:

- Helped focus attention within the respective agencies on the issues of violence and discrimination facing LGBTI people in developing countries. In an interview, one donor partner's program manager indicated that within the agency the GDP raised awareness of LGBTI issues among its own staff members including staff of Embassies in the GDP's focus countries. Within one agency, it generated 'political push' to expand work to address issues of anti-LGBTI violence and discrimination globally as opposed to engaging only at the country level. With this heightened awareness, the agency began paying more attention to addressing anti-LGBTI violence and discrimination in regional and technical strategies.

"We started thinking more about synergies among our own initiatives and linking them with one another in complementary efforts to maximize the positive effects for LGBTI people" – Donor partner

At the implementing partner level:

- A program manager of one of the implementing partners reported that the GDP's well-defined reporting requirements prompted the organization to reflect on its own data collection mechanisms as well as the mechanisms of its grantee organizations. Much of the quantitative data required for reporting had not historically been collected from grantee partners, which has resulted in many instances of requesting

clarification, additional details, or greater accuracy. However, it encouraged the organization to be more engaged with other organizations, to be more intentional in gathering information from them, and to be more connected with and embedded in the eco-system of the LGBTI communities in the focus countries. Furthermore, in the course of the GDP, a significant confidentiality amendment was agreed upon, which signified both USAID's flexibility and the mutual priority placed on the safety, security, and confidentiality of grantee partners.

"The GDP enabled us to transform from a domestic organization to an American research institution that does international work." – Implementing partner

At the grantee organization level:

- In Serbia, a grantee organization reported that GDP reporting requirements and systematic data collection improved its understanding of the extent to which activities have supported the human rights of LGBTI people and led to internal reflection on the practicality and functionality of its approach to M&E. The GDP encouraged changes to organizational strategy in data collection and the development of a gender and social inclusion strategy for the organization.

The GDP contributed to expansion in number of staff particularly among implementing partner and grantee organizations/CSO partners.

Another example of internal growth includes creating new administrative and programmatic positions within the implementing partners and grantee organizations/CSO partners. For instance, in light of the internal developments and international program advances spurred by the GDP:

- One implementing partner hired an international programs director to manage its new international portfolio.
- Another implementing partner established new positions and grew by hiring three additional staff members, a consultant, and administrative assistant. According to a staff member interviewed, *"it made a difference in our capacity working with smaller LGBTI movements and organizations globally, which are well positioned to make a transformative and lasting change. We are also able to focus more strategically on selected countries and regions."*
- Several grantee organizations/CSO partners interviewed in Colombia, Serbia, and South Africa spoke about hiring new staff or an increased number of recruited volunteers in response to the growth or expansions of their programs and activities spurred by the GDP.
- In Colombia, a grantee organization hired, for the very first time, a professional accountant and doubled the number of associated volunteers.

The GDP has motivated, particularly grantee organizations, to focus on effective use of their financial resources and to reflect on their financial sustainability.

The evaluation found that the GDP has motivated organizations to focus on effective use of their financial resources and to reflect on their financial sustainability. We found that:

- In Peru, a grantee organization independently applied for funding from international donors including National Endowment for Democracy, International Trans Fund, and Mama Cash. It was the organization's first major attempt to independently mobilize resources critical for the financial sustainability of the organization. It also gave the organization confidence to pursue local financial opportunities. In 2016, the organization received financial support for advocacy-focused activities from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, International IDEA, and the Spanish Cultural Center in Lima.

In some other instances, the GDP prompted the realization that any activities or programs aimed at supporting and empowering LGBTI individuals and CSOs need to be accompanied by emergency response funds. Such funds, according to grantee organizations interviewed in Colombia and South Africa, would be available, particularly, in case of a beneficiary's involvement with legal justice system (e.g., covering costs of legal representation), addressing livelihood essentials (e.g., lack of shelter, food, urgent health needs including well-being and mental health), or covering specific needs (e.g., transportation to a training, schools/program fees) – particularly for individuals facing violence and discrimination.

4.1.3 How has the GDP increased capacity and changed approaches to capacity-building for LGBTI individuals and CSOs?

Many of the changes to the capacity-building for LGBTI individuals and CSOs have been associated with organizational changes as described above. For many implementing partners and grantee organizations/CSO partners organizational change was a necessary component of revisions or improvements to capacity building. For many, organizational change and capacity-building change referred to the same process. As a director of a grantee organization explains, *“we have increased our ability to serve the LGBTI community simply because we grew and expanded as organization, invested in skills of our staff, [and] have established networks and connections with other organizations ...[in the country].”*

The GDP has triggered changes to approaches to capacity building among implementing partner and grantee organizations.

Several grantee organizations indicated organizational changes, which then prompted revisions or improvements to capacity building approaches. Some, for instance, have

instituted a top-down organizational change which began with revisions to internal policies or practices and then allowed a bottom-up organizational approach (e.g., provision of skills to staff) or a top-down organizational approach (e.g., establishing a new coalition or joining a new organization). As several of the implementing partners are moving deeper in their working relationships with grantee organizations, we found that changes to capacity building involved strengthening the relationships between organizations to address specific issues. We learned that others have instituted a community organizing approach, in which individual community members were drawn into forming new organizations or joining existing ones to improve specific outcomes. Additionally, several of the GDP implementing partners have implemented strategic commitments to work directly and closely with local partners - organizations, consultants, and technical experts - in any advocacy, training, or research efforts and to involve them in all steps of project design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. For instance:

- In an interview, a program manager of an implementing partner indicated that because of the exposure to a large number of CSO partners with localized knowledge and contextualized experience gained through the GDP the organization now works with these partners directly when developing and implementing activities, noting *“for us it is the way to build the capacity of these organizations.”*
- Another implementing partner, which traditionally focused on independently conducting research and data collection on LGBTI populations in developing countries, committed to have input from local organizations (either as partners or as experts) in these countries on the design and approach to any research study. Furthermore, the organization committed to building the research capacity of these local partners as part of any further research engagements. According to one of the directors, it has been a lesson learned from the GDP, *“We have faced some difficulties in application of pre-designed methodology on the ground. Only after consulting and discussing with local partners, including sharing our experience and knowledge with them, we were able to move forward with the research.”*
- In two instances, changes to capacity building efforts involved the inclusion of criminal justice system staff in trainings around increasing the democratic participation of LGBTI leaders. Prior, these trainings largely engaged local grassroots organizations and experts.
- In an interview, a program manager of an implementing partner indicated, *“For us the change meant bringing on board new partners, which we have not traditionally involved, and creating new multi-level and multi-partner connections among them rather than focusing solely on one group.”*
- In South Africa, consultations conducted by a grantee organization with the local community as part of a research grant revealed severe limitations among the LGBTI

constituency in articulating their stories and experiences related to SOGIE-based discrimination and violence. As a result, the grantee organization invested in training local communities in story-telling, and training select community members in participatory research techniques, something the organization had not practiced earlier. The organization now has the capacity to include the local LGBTI constituency in actual data collection as part of any new research project.

The GDP has helped to expand the strategic mission of grantee organizations to address specific needs and vulnerabilities of the LGBTI sub-groups.

We found that the GDP – particularly its research efforts, CommsLabs, RFSL’s Rainbow Leaders training, and trainings on participation in democratic processes – motivated several grantee organizations to expand their strategic missions. It also affected the way organizations build capacity of LGBTI individuals and organizations, and support and empower LGBTI people. For instance:

- In Serbia, the GDP (particularly staff member’s participation in RFSL’s training) contributed to a programmatic ‘revolution,’ as reported by a staff member interviewed, by motivating the grantee organization to reflect on the extent to which its programs consider the issue of an individual’s multiple identities in the design of inputs and outputs.
- Participation in CommsLabs and RSFL’s training led a South Africa-based grantee organization working predominantly in HIV prevention among men who have sex with men to reflect on the significance of addressing diverse sexual orientations, gender identities, and vulnerabilities including socioeconomic status, nationality, and racial identity. As a result, the organization expanded its mission to include lesbian women, transgender men, and transgender women of color.
- For another South African grantee organization, participation in CommsLabs affected change in its organizational mission, leading to the inclusion of intersex and bisexual individuals into its existing advocacy activities.
- In Peru, a grantee organization’s mission to support and empower transgender people through advocacy and awareness raising was expanded to include SOGIE-focused research. The expansion was spurred by the findings of a research funded by the GDP and led by this organization.
- CommLabs motivated another South African grantee organization, predominately serving a black lesbian constituency, to invite the broader LGBTI community to its community-based activities. It further added the subject of male circumcision to its HIV/AIDS awareness-raising trainings and included in its violence prevention workshops a discussion on SOGIE-based violence rather than violence against lesbians only.

“Our events and activities, the groups which we establish, are still focused on black lesbians but now also include transgender people and gay men.” – Executive Director, grantee organization, South Africa

In addition to expanding strategic missions, some grantee organizations noted that the GDP also motivated the development of new programs and the expansion of services offered.

- In Colombia, a grantee organization created a new program with the aim of improving the working conditions of the LGBTI population, generating strategies that facilitate employability in diverse and inclusive work environments. The same organization is now hosting an annual (and one of the fastest growing) LGBTI international business summits in the region which includes a series of conferences, forums, panels, and trainings focused on the LGBT market niche.

“It was a very unique engagement for us. It is because we don’t usually engage in ‘partnerships’ because we don’t want to give an impression and run into a situation of working on issues pre-determined by a funding source agenda. We strongly believe in academic freedom and independence of research. Our partnerships are usually based on the model: principle investigator – research assistant. We work together and then generate independent findings, impartial of any political or social agenda. [The GDP] has been a valuable experience for us. Our staff considers such partnerships as important step towards global collaboration and networking among research and other institutions. This is a significant change for our organization. It has a huge impact not just on us, but also on the smaller, local research organizations we work with.” – Implementing partner

We found that the GDP increased the capacity to make the advancement of the human rights of LGBTI individuals and the economic consequences of LGBTI discrimination visible and heard in the global arenas. KIIIs found that the GDP: (i) provided LGBTI individuals, grantee organization/CSO partners, and staff members of both implementing partners and grantee organizations/CSO partners access to unprecedented in-depth trainings on organizational leadership, political participation, and digital advocacy and communications; and (ii) strengthened the capacity of LGBTI individuals and staff members through thematic workshops; learning exchanges; partner meetings on the local, regional, and global level; and engagement with experts in human rights, politics, and technology.

4.1.4 How has the GDP enhanced coordination between and among grantee organizations, implementing, and donor partners? Has the GDP helped create and sustain linkages between LGBTI advocacy groups and organizations?

The GDP has helped partner organizations at all levels strengthen existing networks and working relationships with other organizations and partners.

The evaluation found that many of the GDP partner organizations were able to further expand or strengthen their own networks and existing working relationships - with bilateral, multilateral, or international partners - as well as formal or informal relationships with grassroots-level organizations. In some instances, the GDP provided an opportunity to re-build relationships with former partners or re-establish working relationship with local CSO in focus countries. In some other instances it promoted, as in the case of one of the resource partners, a deeper involvement with another organization. In an interview, a donor partner indicated, *“in some of the GDP focus countries where we have bilateral relations, we started to be more involved with local gay and lesbian organizations.”*

“We have fortified existing relationships with local human rights agencies, in addition to gaining access to new government stakeholders including political party leaders, members of the National Assembly and other parliamentarians. We see them now as important partners rather than opposition in the advancement of LGBTI agenda in Serbia.” – Executive Director, grantee organization, Serbia.

Stronger networks and working relationships led many grantee organizations to take tangible actions aimed at supporting and empowering LGBTI people in their target communities. For instance:

- In South Africa, a grantee organization held a one-day Civil Society Forum in November 2016 in Cape Town, which attracted South African political party representatives, LGBTI leaders, and allies. The forum consisted of several panel discussions with LGBTI political leaders to discuss the current political issues in South Africa and their impact on the LGBTI community.
- In Serbia, a grantee organization held a thematic conference, which brought together past participants of democratic participation trainees and other local and regional leaders, advocates, and experts from the Western Balkans to discuss the experiences of LGBTI people in the region.
- In South Africa, a grantee organization successfully facilitated financial and logistical support for movement activities from other LGBTI and human rights-focused organizations.

CommsLabs activities also motivated grantee organization to use expanded networks to administer joint action. For instance:

- Grantee organizations in South Africa and Kenya, which had both attended the CommsLabs meetings in Cape Town and Nairobi, engaged in mutual support in the use of technology for LGBTI non-discrimination efforts. Jointly, the organizations started a social media-based platform to promote protections and rights of LGBTI individuals regionally.
- Also, in South Africa, a digital network has been established among several GDP grantee organizations as a mechanism for knowledge exchange, asking and providing support and advice, and sharing of information about events and activities.

The GDP has helped partner organizations at all levels of the GDP to establish new networks and working relationships locally, regionally, and globally.

“[The GDP] built new relationships and brought new partners on board [who] are very valuable as main players in the LGBTI field. Embassies have also benefited, as they now have closer connections and relationships with local organizations and partners.” – Donor partner

The evaluation found that the GDP spurred the establishment of new connections and linkages among partner organizations. These resulted in long-lasting professional and personal connections between and among grantees, implementing partners, and donor partners as well as other leaders, organizations, and communities. Key informants interviewed have had an overwhelmingly positive experience with how the GDP enhanced their ability to connect with others, and to build strong, multi-cultural, and multi-national working relationships with LGBTI organizations, experts, decision-makers, and stakeholders. For instance:

- For one implementing partner, the GDP was a great opportunity to meet other research groups from countries where they had no previous working experience.
- For another implementing partner, the GDP helped to facilitate opportunities for negotiations with multilateral bodies such as the United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative.
- Training conducted by one implementing partner brought together a number of LGBTI leaders. It created a network of personal and professional connections and opportunities. According to several key informants, including implementing partner staff, a number of benefits can be derived from this development including participation in international conferences, exchange of information about funding opportunities, and sharing of information, knowledge, and best practices.

- In Colombia, the GDP helped a grantee organization expand its cooperation and collaboration within Latin America. It helped to establish a new working relationship with partners in Dominican Republic and Mexico to promote the development of businesses, ventures, and products and innovations aimed at the LGBTI community. The organization was also able to further leverage local and regional partnerships including USAID mission, the United States Commercial Services in Colombia, the International Gay & Lesbian Travel Association, and LGBT chambers of commerce in Latin and South America.

“The GDP provided us with new connections and expanded our existing linkages with LGBTI CSOs globally... It made us connected with CSOs we did not work with before.” – Program Director, implementing partner

“Today, our global portfolio spans Western and Eastern Europe; we are progressively moving into work in South and Latin America. We have also fortified our working relationships with partners in developed economies and started working with partners in countries which are emerging economies.” – Program manager, implementing partner

4.1.5 How effective have the GDP’s efforts been in leveraging additional resources, linkages, partnerships, and opportunities with and among implementing and donor partners, advocacy groups, and other organizations?

The GDP has helped to improve financial sustainability of partner organizations, particularly mobilizing resources and leveraging new funding opportunities.

The unique character of the GDP (based on the premise of long-term investment including in organizational development and internal capacity building) allowed many of the GDP partner organizations to independently leverage additional resources.

First, the evaluation found that the GDP has helped partner organizations at all levels - donor, implementing partner and grantee organizations/CSO partners - to mobilize additional resources. In an interview, one implementing partner organization staff stated that the collaboration between USAID and Sida enhanced relationships with other donors, many of which came on board with financial support throughout the life of the GDP. One implementing partner received a number of new donations in response to the GDP funding. It also leveraged additional funding opportunities, including a three-year grant for its domestic and international work, as well as several new requests for technical assistance - including one from the World Bank.

“Our members and donors were excited that the U.S. Government is investing in the cause.... [protecting LGBTI people from violence and discrimination]. People really

wanted to match the grant we received, they wanted to support us. For us, the ability to leverage new opportunities was significant.” – Director, implementing partner

Secondly, several other grantee organizations indicated that the GDP has helped them leverage additional resources, particularly in-kind donations from airlines, hotels, and other businesses. The GDP funding also coexisted with other contributions, which allowed implementing partners and grantee organizations to boost their existing programs and cross-pollinate activities within the organization, as well as with other global, regional, and local stakeholders.

Thirdly, the GDP’s interventions, which included development of fundraising skills and methodologies, contributed to improved financial operation, particularly of grantee organizations, through mobilization of resources or leveraging new funding opportunities. The GDP increased organizations’ capacities to seek resources from a diverse pool of other funders. With better understanding of fundraising, the organizations have become stronger and have grounded their work in new ways. Collective development of proposals, increased efficiency, more engaged and informed staff, and clearer leadership have all had an impact on more successful fundraising. For instance:

- In Colombia, a grantee organization used new financial reporting knowledge and practical fundraising skills to successfully apply for an additional grant available through the U.S. Embassy’s Economic Section.
- In South Africa, a grantee organization used fundraising skills gained through the GDP to mobilize local donors, securing funds for the next two years. The same organization is also currently in funding negotiations with the local Department of Social Development.

4.1.6 In what ways has GDP support helped LGBTI organizations overcome challenges in pursuing their objectives? Have beneficiaries experienced any challenges in accessing / utilizing GDP support?

The evaluation found that the GDP has helped organizations increase and in some cases establish a global footprint. It helped organizations at all levels of the GDP increase their visibility, credibility, and reputation on the local, regional, and global scale. Secondly, the GDP has activated internal growth and organizational changes (including expansion of programs and targets, changes in organizational structure, and the strengthening of management mechanisms and approaches) which led to the ability to overcome challenges in pursuing organizational objectives. Finally, the GDP has been effective in providing LGBTI organizations with measurable gains in organizational abilities, including their confidence and trust in their own abilities to pursue organizational objectives.

Overcoming challenges through global footprint, increased visibility, credibility, and reputation.

Interviews with LGBTI leaders and researchers from several of the GDP donor partners, implementing partners, and grantee organizations/CSO partners point to the conclusion that limited visibility and a lack of organizational credibility (among smaller grantee organizations) can pose challenges in the implementation of efforts to advocate for the human rights of LGBTI individuals. Further, several key informants interviewed indicated that this invisibility and related limited credibility is often due to the various manifestations of discrimination and violence against LGBTI people.

We found that the GDP has significantly increased the global footprint and recognition of its implementing partners and grantee organizations/CSO partners. As a result, these organizations were able to promote and disseminate empowering and accurate information about the LGBTI community, create opportunities and safe spaces for dialogue with diverse partners, provide claims to and recognition of identity, and forge mutual understanding among and between a diverse range of stakeholders.

At the donor partner level, the GDP was a unique opportunity for two governmental agencies to establish dialogue and bring global attention to the issue of SOGIE in development. For the two agencies, the GDP was an important opportunity to showcase how bilateral partners can work together to advance the human rights of LGBTI people in development cooperation.

At the implementing partner and grantee organization/CSO partner level, the GDP provided many organizations, particularly the grantee organizations, with a platform for domestic and/or international visibility that was lacking. In many cases it gave the organizations a sense of legitimacy, credibility, and recognition as local or international experts on a subject matter.²¹ In several instances, it also boosted organizational reputation as a research-capable institution. For instance:

- In Peru, thanks to the leadership in a research effort, a grantee organization gained national recognition and credibility as a knowledgeable expert on issues related to violence against LGBTI individuals in the country. Today, the organization serves as a community-based advisor to the government on issues related to SOGIE. A staff member of a Lima-based grantee organization stated: *“We are now invited to*

²¹ We did not find examples of negative impact of increased visibility among any of the organizations interviewed. However, it could be possible in some cases that public affiliation with foreign funding agencies (e.g., USAID or Sida) could have brought extra attention or led to additional scrutiny by local government authorities.

government-led meetings and have seats at tables, which were not available to us before.”

A key informant at the implementing partner level added:

“Over the years the GDP evolved, as the socio-political and economic context of the focus countries has changed. As the GDP started to gain recognition and reputation, more opportunities appeared and became available to us.”

We found that (i) the participation in development and implementation of trainings on democratic participation processes, and (ii) the participation in development and subsequent dissemination of research findings,²² provided many of the interviewed organizations with credibility on the local, regional, and global scale. Those who participated in development and implementation of trainings on democratic participation processes reported increased recognition by stakeholders they work with (e.g., government officials, legislative agencies, experts from other CSOs, etc.) of their expertise and knowledge on LGBTI issues. For grantee organizations and implementing partners who participated in research activities, the opportunity to put their name on the research findings meant increased credibility as organization or research institution. Staff from one implementing partner noted that research papers developed under the GDP elevated the organization’s position as an academic research institution. Furthermore, the GDP helped to fortify the organization’s role as leader in SOGIE-specific law and policy research.

Overcoming challenges by strengthening of internal management mechanisms and approaches.

We found that the GDP helped organizations overcome challenges by strengthening their management systems and internal structures. Several key informants shared examples of how their organizations have improved through the incorporation of specific organizational, strategic, or programmatic changes. Others reported that some challenges remain, but they now have a greater awareness of what needs to be done. Some examples of internal practices shared by the informants include increased focus on the well-being of staff. It is an important area of change that respondents have identified and attributed to GDP. CommsLabs and RFSL’s Rainbow Leaders training were the most cited attributions to this change. Research suggests that social justice and human rights activists, whose work is fraught with unique challenges, can be

²² Including landscape analyses and research on democratic participation and the relationship between LGBT inclusion and economic development.

especially susceptible to vocational burn-out.²³ Several of the grantee organizations met in the evaluation process pointed out that GDP allowed them to recognize internal challenges such as staff burn-out. It is an important reality for people working to address LGBTI-related violence and discrimination due to constant negative pressures, endless advocacy needs, limited financial resources, and often hostile and dangerous external working environments.

Staff of several other grantee organizations interviewed provided examples of efforts that their organizations have taken to ensure the well-being of their staff. For example, in Serbia, a grantee organization created weekly “vent-out” meetings, in which staff members openly discuss and address challenges of their daily work.

“We introduced wellness and stress management class in our organization to prevent regular burnout and fatigue among our colleagues.” – Program manager, grantee organization, South Africa

It is important to note that, while there are positive effects of the GDP – particularly grantee and implementing partners organizations – new challenges also emerged. For instance, the rapid organizational expansion of several of the grantee organizations and implementing partners also presented unexpected challenges. An implementing partner staff member voiced the following concern:

“The logistics of working internationally was a challenge as we lacked international working experience. We did not know the rapid pace and the complexity of international assignments. Working with different time zones, languages, and people from diverse cultural settings with various work ethics and approaches. We really needed organizational and administrative capacity building.” – Staff member, implementing partner

In an interview in Bogota, Colombia, a staff member of a grantee organization that significantly expanded its size and services rendered during the GDP expressed the following concern:

“I am not afraid with the continuum of the work but rather with the quality, and the possibility of losing the valuable personal connection and human touch we developed with our constituency.”

In an interview, staff of an implementing partner stated:

²³ Cher Weixia Chen and Paul C. Gorski. 2015. *Burnout in Social Justice and Human Rights Activists: Symptoms, Causes and Implications*. Oxford University Press.

“Our work grows usually very organically. Firstly, we establish contacts with local experts and researchers. Then, we start our projects. But with the GDP, we entered new spaces and locations very quickly where we did not have contacts or expertise yet.”

These statements and further observations gathered through the evaluation process suggest that rapid organizational developments, while positive, could have an impact on service quality in the future if not carefully planned and managed.

Measurable gains in organizational abilities, confidence, and trust in own abilities to pursue objectives and overcome challenges.

“Working with [another partner] proved to us that working on LGBTI [issues] is possible. It provided us with confidence and credibility. We take [the partners’] example and advocate more within our own agency; we can say ‘look what they are doing... [LGBTI work].... it can be done.’” – Project manager, donor partner

Another substantial effect of the GDP on the participating organizations is an increase in confidence and trust in their own abilities as organizations to pursue objectives and overcome challenges. This cannot be emphasized enough, given the political and cultural challenges in the advancement of the human rights of LGBTI individuals, and the closing space for civil society in many of these countries. For the majority the implementing partners and grantee organizations, the GDP built their confidence and trust in own organizational knowledge, skills, abilities, and capacity to provide support to LGBTI individuals and to helping broader communities to empower LGBTI individuals.

“The multi-partner character and the combination of multiple components of the GDP gave us wider vision of how we can strengthen our work and our programming domestically and internationally. It has rejuvenated the trust in our work. We are encouraged and believe in our self. It gave us confidence.” –Executive Director, grantee organization, South Africa

We found similar effects at the grantee organization level. For instance, in Colombia, a presentation of a grantee organization’s portfolio led to implementation of a sensitization training on SOGIE of over 300 policemen in Bogotá. As relayed by the organization’s CEO, the trained policemen have gained skills and confidence to provide equal treatment and better address, in respectful and non-violent ways, the needs and vulnerabilities of the LGBTI individuals in the area. The CEO calls this *“a giant step in the direction of protection and promotion of LGBTI rights in Colombia.”*

Another result of the increased confidence in organizational capacity to serve a broader community is showcased by a grantee organization in South Africa. Approached by one

of South Africa's largest financial service providers, the grantee organization developed and implemented a training presentation on SOGIE at the workplace for its management. The successful completion of the training opened up additional opportunities for a roll-out of the training to all national offices. As the organization's program manager states, *"We want to access new spaces and see ourselves as LGBTI leaders in the private sector."*

4.1.7 What are the areas of improvement for effective GDP support?

The evaluation also identified several challenges within the GDP, which are grouped into the following areas:

Area I: Procedural challenges

The field-based evaluation revealed several procedural challenges experienced by implementing and donor partners. As the GDP was the first time that most of the partners worked together, there were steep institutional learning curves. Among the challenges the partners had to work through were staff turnover, personnel shifts/new points of contact at the donor and implementing partner levels, delays in processing financial transactions, understanding and meeting robust reporting requirements, and changes in the offices/bureaus that managed the GDP within the donor partner institutions (i.e., oversight for the GDP moved from offices focused partnerships to offices focused on democracy and human rights).

Area II: Coordination and communication among all partners

While the GDP has managed to reach its expected outcomes, there are some areas where partners noted opportunities for improved coordination and communication. As the space for LGBTI civil society and LGBTI rights is shrinking in many countries, and advocacy gains are under continuous threat, several organizations noted that the GDP could better facilitate long-term connections and coordination of efforts among all of its partner and beneficiary organizations.

Additionally, some key informants suggested that more could have been done to facilitate and explore opportunities for working directly with donor partners (e.g., take greater advantage of the breadth of USAID and Sida's expertise). According to a staff member of an implementing partner, it would have been helpful to hear ideas and recommendations around ways to build on Sida's support. For example, implementing partners would welcome Sida serving as an entry point to engage neighboring donors such as the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation and the Finnish Government as potential donor partners in the GDP. It was also suggested that implementing partners could also have benefitted more from the donor partners' vast networks of global contacts.

Some key informants noted that while the communication channels between the donor and implementing partners were established, communication channels among implementing partners and grantee organizations/CSO partners could be strengthened to improve knowledge exchange or sharing of results, lessons learned, and best practices.

Informants from implementing partner organizations noted that they prepared and delivered several presentations to each USAID Mission in each of the GDP countries to help coordinate in-country GDP activities and provide updates on the progress that implementing partners and grantee organizations/CSO partners made towards development outcomes. The presentations proved to be an effective method for providing information to the Missions about the GDP and the work of each organization. That said, representatives of several grantee organizations/CSO organizations noted that they did not have significant direct interaction with donor partner staff. Several key informants from grantee organizations would have welcomed additional engagement opportunities with USAID Mission representatives. Others noted a desire to share and apply the GDP's best practices and lessons learned across all levels of the GDP.

“There is a need for organizations to be better connected with one another and continue the good work as a group to bring their commitment and networks together and to ensure the results.” – Program Manager, grantee organization, South Africa

Conclusions from the interviews with key informants at the donor partner level also point out the limited direct communication with grantee organizations. A contributing factor may be the limited pre-existing direct working relationship between the two donor partners and the grantee organizations/CSO partners in focus countries, in addition to the organizational practice of working through implementing partners.

Area III: Communication between and among grantee organizations

The evaluation found that the cross-cutting communication between and among grantee organizations could also be significantly increased. In Colombia, the evaluation team found that while there was some level of communication between Latin American grantee organization/CSO partners, there was limited communication with other GDP grantee organizations/CSO partners from outside the region. Such communication took place between and among GDP grantee organizations that knew each other, have worked with one another prior the GDP, or have specifically established and maintained direct contact through any of the GDP gatherings. One representative from a grantee organization indicated, *“There was no listserv or official platform to communicate. We lacked formal opportunities to share our results GDP-wide and to learn about the best practices and accomplishments of other organizations. This is a lost opportunity to build momentum.”*

Area IV: Transparency of the GDP structure

The evaluation findings also suggest that, particularly early in the GDP, more attention could have been paid to providing clarity regarding each specific organization's role within the broader GDP. In an interview, staff of one grantee organization indicated, *"it was [initially] not clear to me that we were part of the GDP."* According to an implementing partner's program manager, it was the annual all partners meeting in May 2014 in Washington, DC that fully clarified the organization's position in the GDP. A staff member of an implementing partner indicated that while some elements of the GDP have been clear, namely, the relationship between implementing partners and grantee organizations/CSO partners, the implementing partner had an incomplete understanding of their position in relation to donor partners. It was also suggested that the first all partner meeting should have occurred earlier in the life of the GDP as early on there was a missed *"opportunity to exchange programs design or methodology concepts and to learn from one another."*

Evaluation Team members who administered the training of grant beneficiaries from Colombia, Peru, Honduras, and the Dominican Republic on the MSC technique in September 2017 in Bogota, Colombia made similar observations. Grantee organization staff perceived they are part of a partnership managed by one of the implementing partner organizations in Latin America rather than a bilateral, government-initiated and led global initiative. When asked about the funding source, one of the grant beneficiaries responded: *"I didn't know we have funding from Sida or this American organization called USAID."*²⁴ Training participants stated that the lack of clear understanding of the GDP structure and members represented *"a lost opportunity to find a common ground"* for collaboration, particularly among those who work with diverse sub-groups of the LGBTI spectrum. Similar conclusions are to be drawn from KIIs with implementing partners, who pointed out that some partner organizations could have had more opportunities for collaboration if the understanding of the GDP organizational structure would have been shared earlier.

"We lacked communication or information exchange about what is happening within GDP. We didn't know who received funding." – Program manager, implementing partner

Area V: Value of enhanced knowledge management

²⁴ Approximately 85% of grants provided through the GDP used leveraged (i.e., non-USAID, non-Sida) funds, as implementing partners are required to leverage USAID's funds with third-party contributions (i.e., from corporations, private foundations) at a minimum 1:1 ratio. As such, the majority of grantee organizations did not receive funds from USAID or Sida.

Key informants agreed that GDP has equipped LGBTI leaders and CSOs with a set of valuable knowledge related to media, communications, and technology. It has also provided them with practical skills on how to effectively participate in democratic processes, run organizations, and understand LGBTI law and policy issues. However, in the course of the evaluation, we found that translation of the high-level know-how into own contexts and realities proved to be a challenge. For instance:

- For several smaller grantee organizations in Colombia, Serbia, and South Africa, which operate mostly with limited human and financial resources, the wider application of new knowledge of social media and technology for advocacy was not always feasible due to time and human capacity constraints.

“There was a lot of information but not enough time to digest. At the end, we had to focus on few only things, as there are only three of us here.” – Staff member, grantee organization, South Africa

Area VI: Contextualization of interventions to improve effectiveness

While interventions were based on highly consultative country-level research, the evaluation identified barriers and missed opportunities for approaching specific regional and country contexts: language of intra-partner communication; socio-economic, racial, ethnic or cultural diversity of beneficiaries; legal and policy environments; social conditions; and traditions in the focus countries. For instance:

- In Colombia, a grantee organization suggested that moving forward, the GDP and its partners should have a clear strategy in place to engage bisexual and intersex populations as well as the most economically disadvantaged LGBTI individuals.
- Another grantee organization in Colombia suggested the GDP should have a specific focus on inclusion of LGBTI individuals of color and LGBTI people from ethnic minorities.
- In Serbia, a grantee organization that partnered in the development and implementation of a LGBTI capacity building training noted that it would have benefited from more context-specific approaches.
- In South Africa, staff members of a grantee organization suggested that the training should have involved more local trainers and facilitators.

4.2 WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF THE LGBTI GDP ON BENEFICIARIES?

The evaluation sought to better understand a range of effects of the GDP on beneficiaries – primarily LGBTI people in developing countries – and the grantee organizations/CSO partners. The evaluation found that GDP has had wide-spanning positive impacts on beneficiaries, especially in addressing the day-to-day challenges

that result from the violence and discrimination faced by LGBTI individuals. Grants, training (i.e., CommsLabs, democratic participation trainings), and research activities have helped grantee organizations provide improved support for individual beneficiaries. This evaluation also found that grantee organizations helped individual beneficiaries navigate social and institutional discrimination, develop a greater awareness of their human rights, and advocate for themselves and others. These tools have helped beneficiaries identify and create inclusive environments, including work places. The evaluation also found that GDP activities had some unexpected positive impacts on beneficiaries, including 1) confidence building, 2) access to networks that reduced feelings of isolation and unlocked opportunities for organizing, and 3) a sense of personal empowerment and ability to advocate for protections and rights.

4.2.1 What have been the effects of GDP interventions on beneficiaries and their communities?

In particular:

- What have been the most significant changes for groups within the LGBTI community (from the perspective of project beneficiaries and implementing/donor partners) as a result of the GDP? Have there been any unintended/unexpected results?
- Has the GDP increased economic, political, social, individual, and/or collective empowerment within the LGBTI community? If so, how? Have lesbian women, gay men, bisexual people, transgender women/men, and intersex individuals been equally empowered?
- As a result of the GDP, to what extent do beneficiaries (both individuals and groups) feel more empowered to advocate on their own behalf?
- To what extent have beneficiaries (both individuals and organizations) been able to leverage the resources provided by the GDP to expand their networks? To obtain further resources?

The GDP had multiple positive effects on beneficiaries

Over the course of the evaluation, the team realized that many of the identified and interviewed beneficiaries were not exclusively part of one GDP intervention, but rather, affiliated with grantee organizations/CSO partners or implementing partners as part of several simultaneous activities. As such, many of the beneficiaries with whom we met spoke of the effects that were attributed to the overall GDP rather than one specific GDP activity. Overall, beneficiaries reported that support (i.e., grants, trainings, CommsLabs, research, economic empowerment activities) from GDP-funded organizations resulted in individual and collective empowerment, increased autonomy, and a sense of communal support. Beneficiaries also reported that trainings and CommsLabs provided critical spaces to establish personal and professional connections

and refine their personal and organizational advocacy through knowledge-sharing and experience exchange.

MSC stories revealed rampant violence and discrimination against LGBTI people

The evaluation collected impact stories from individual beneficiaries. Due to their sensitive nature and to protect the confidentiality of LGBTI individuals, we do not include any beneficiary's impact story in its entirety. Grantee organizations were given the freedom to select the beneficiaries to be interviewed for MSC stories, and were encouraged to collect diverse stories representing all populations within the LGBTI spectrum. The beneficiaries quoted below are not necessarily representative of all beneficiaries of each grantee organization, as some populations within the LGBTI spectrum may be overrepresented or underrepresented. However, a recurring theme across the stories is the daily struggle of LGBTI individuals facing violence and discrimination. Due to high stigma levels in their countries, many beneficiaries have faced violence and discrimination at both the social and institutional levels. At the social level, many beneficiaries recounted stories of exclusion from their families and communities:

“I am a bisexual woman, but had always stayed away from the LGBTI world and denied who I was, because all those that “came out of the closet” in my town were killed.” – Bisexual woman in Latin America

“[When] I returned at 15 to say what I am today - a trans girl – very few of my family members accepted me, I received a lot of abuse from my older brothers, physical and verbal.” – Transgender woman in Latin America

“When I was 14 I told my family about my sexual orientation, they rejected me and kicked me out of the house, so I found shelter in drugs.” – Gay man in Latin America

At the institutional level, many beneficiaries reported facing violence and discrimination from police, governments, and legal frameworks.

“When we wore women’s clothes, the police would deprive us of our liberty from three to six months, during which we were victims of all types of abuse and violations to our rights. We were also punished for being trans women, ...They would take us to places away from the city, where we were abandoned completely naked.” – Transgender woman in Latin America

Many beneficiaries recounted the critical ways in which grantee organizations provided support in navigating legal systems, establishing protections from institutional violence, and seeking justice. One transgender woman who was the target of multiple murder

attempts, noted that a grantee organization helped her find a way to move out of her country and provided protection while she was still there:

“And of course, I don’t forget the bad things that happened to me in [place X] but I also remember all the support I received from [organization’s members], without [the organization] they would have killed me in my country.” – Transgender woman in Latin America

Another beneficiary noted how a grantee organization helped him navigate the legal system in his country to secure identification that reflected his correct identity:

“If you ask me what was the most significant change? I should say that this was a breakthrough in my life: I had not returned to my country for more than 10 years, the fear of not being able to do so invaded me and the [grantee] organization gave me a light. I went back to travel, having a passport, an identity document with my name, with the one who identifies me. – Transgender Man in Latin America

Beneficiaries also noted that grantee organizations helped them to navigate the social and institutional discrimination that often occurs within workspaces. One beneficiary recalls how a grantee’s organizations efforts to help her find work in a non-discriminatory environment impacted her:

I followed the steps indicated by them to have access to work opportunities and today I have a job. Even though it is not the work I wanted, at least I can survive, but above all, I am working in a place where they don’t discriminate for being a transwoman. Transgender Woman in Latin America

These findings indicate that grantee organizations/CSO partners have been critical in helping LGBTI individuals address the challenges posed by social and institutional discrimination. These findings also suggest that the support beneficiaries received in navigating institutional discrimination from legal frameworks was especially important for transgender beneficiaries. For many beneficiaries, grantee organizations facilitated the safety of many LGBTI individuals in the face of hostile environments in their countries, and confidence in identifying as a member of the LGBTI community. Lastly, grantee organizations also provided beneficiaries with linkages to employment opportunities in non-discriminatory spaces.

There are several unexpected impacts of the LGBTI-GDP on individual beneficiaries

The MSC stories revealed that the three main unexpected impacts of the GDP on beneficiaries included (i) feeling a great deal of psychosocial support, including the fact that someone cared about them, (ii) becoming much more aware of their human rights,

(that is, the right to bodily autonomy, to live free from violence, and the right to live free from persecution or discrimination) and feeling empowered to advocate for themselves; and (iii) helping build and solidify local movements to advocate for protections from violence and discrimination. Connecting with other LGBTI individuals in their own country led to inspiration and the sharing of best practices.

Psychosocial Support

Although most of the grantee organizations/CSO partners did not explicitly set out to provide psychosocial support, it was important in reducing feelings of isolation, and making individual beneficiaries feel valued. This was an important finding, as the discrimination in many of the GDP's focus countries results in feelings of isolation. For many beneficiaries, knowing that genuine, caring support is available was incredibly important.

"[Grantee organization] has been for me of great help, taking into account that I am an older trans woman, that I live alone and that I do not have any support from my family, they accompany me to my medical appointments, they take me into account for all the events that the foundation carries out." – Transgender woman in Latin America

This support has been especially important for beneficiaries who were rejected by their families. As one beneficiary recounts, the psychosocial support from a grantee organization was a critical point in building confidence, turning his life around:

"This change is significant for me because before I felt that my life was lost, but after so much work and motivation my family feels proud of me...it is gratifying that people see this positive change, and to feel and experience it for myself." – Gay man in Latin America

Awareness of Human Rights

Beneficiaries reported that the support received from grantee organizations gave them an increased awareness of their human rights, and provided them with the tools to advocate for themselves, and others. For some individual beneficiaries, their interaction with grantee organizations was the first time they became aware of their right to live free from violence and discrimination.

"The greatest contribution that I have received from that organization is the knowledge of my human rights, because before meeting them I thought that we the trans women had no rights, that rights were a privilege only enjoyed by the cisgender people, so it seemed normal or natural that we were discriminated or that they violated our rights." – Transgender woman in Latin America

In addition to increasing awareness, grantee organizations also provided beneficiaries with concrete, practical ways to protect other LGBTI individuals from violence and discrimination. For many beneficiaries, the heightened awareness of their rights inspired them to increase others' awareness. Much like other GDP activities, this demonstrates a strong sense of ownership of training activities, and the sense that beneficiaries see themselves as agents of change.

“Now I define myself as an empowered Trans Woman and human rights advocate, with skills to contribute to change in the binary and patriarchal world in which we live, and for a more equal country and world with the same opportunities for all.” –

Transgender Woman in Latin America

“[The organization] has taught me about help routes and to advocate for the rights for all those that are like me: LGBTI. I learned especially how to file a complaint and legal resources so that my other LGBTI friends did not have to go through the things I did, and could have access to the same rights as the rest of the people. That is how I realized that I was good as advocating on behalf of others.” – Gay man in Latin America

For beneficiaries, the interaction with a mix of people of diverse sexual orientations and gender identities and expressions, racial and ethnic backgrounds, and socioeconomic backgrounds was highly appreciated and recognized as an opportunity for knowledge sharing and experience exchange. This exchange was also important in helping beneficiaries understand and identify issues within the LGBTI community, and the importance of inclusive activities. A gay man reported that educational workshops administered by a grantee organization were critical in shifting his advocacy focus:

“Before I was not interested in what happened to trans or lesbian women and I did not have any personal relationships with them, but today I love to meet with my peers to discuss about their problems, the possible solutions, and paths.” – Gay man in Latin America

Helping build and solidify local movements to advocate for protections from violence and discrimination

MSC stories revealed that grantee organizations were integral in empowering beneficiaries to build and solidify local movements to advocate for protections for LGBTI individuals. This support was also extremely effective in engaging families of LGBTI individuals who had experienced violence and discrimination. MSC stories from beneficiary family members noted a heightened sense of awareness of violence and discrimination, as well as a desire to contribute to local movements, and the

advancement of the human rights of LGBTI individuals. Following the death of a prominent LGBTI leader in Latin America, one family member noted:

“[Support from the organization] gave us enough courage... as family members of an LGBTI person... to report a crime that many other people [might not have due to] the fear of retaliation or what [others] will say. And it is that since we reported what happened with my brother, they began to know more cases that had occurred in the same situation.”

In addition to expanding advocacy, MSC stories revealed that grantee organizations provided opportunities for expanded networks that created valuable institutional partnerships. By leveraging these networks and engaging allies, a GDP-supported chamber of commerce identified local businesses that would be inclusive to LGBTI employees. Engagement with such businesses also helped each business reflect on their roles, and prioritize LGBTI-inclusive hiring practices. As a business leader in Colombia reports:

“Finding the Chamber’s support has allowed not only meeting companies from the LGBT community and carrying out excellent negotiations, but also to contribute so that when LGBT people that are looking for more dignified jobs, they see the bank as another alternative. Today I can say that I am a person that has initiated a new path towards studying human rights and that, thanks to initiatives like these, I have seen the great opportunities that the LGBT community has thanks to entrepreneurial people that I keep in my heart today as great friends.” – Chief of personnel, bank in Colombia

MSC stories also demonstrated the ways in which such networks encouraged collaboration to expand activities into other countries. With the support and mentorship of a GDP-supported chamber of commerce in Colombia, one beneficiary became a leader in his own organization, and used the position to promote the economic inclusion of LGBTI people in his own country:

“The support...helped me as a member of the LGBT community to be able to reach my organization’s presidency and in this way help other members of the LGBT community to reach their goals, promoting equality and inclusion in [country].” Gay Man in Latin America

MSC stories outlined the harsh everyday realities for many LGBTI individuals and communities, particularly in Latin America. These stories also outline how the grantee organizations minimized feelings of isolation, empowered beneficiaries to advocate for themselves and other LGBTI individuals, and provided critical support and guidance to navigate social and institutional violence and discrimination. Lastly, MSC stories outline

the ways in which expanded networks have effectively engaged allies and allowed for expansion of grantee organization activities.

4.2.2 Which trainings provided by the GDP have been most useful? What challenges have been encountered? Which trainings could be improved, and how?

Beneficiaries reported that the democratic participations trainings were extremely valuable. Beneficiaries in Serbia and South Africa found that the training has improved participants' skills in public speaking, formulation of valid arguments, and conducting debates. This has led to a number of concrete improvements including a numbers of public speaking engagements such as conferences, TV and radio appearances, and print media interviews.

Furthermore, for many beneficiaries (as well as the participating grantee organizations) the training allowed them to enter spaces previously limited to others. For instance:

- In an interview, a South Africa-based LGBTI beneficiary stated, “this was a really good opportunity for me. I usually don't work with these ...[political parties] stakeholders. It triggered my interest and reinforced the commitment to work with them in the transformative change that is needed.”
- In Serbia, an LGBTI person who helped in the design and implementation of the training was inspired to engage with several local political parties in conducting awareness raising and SOGIE-focused sensitization discussions.

For some beneficiaries, the training inspired a personal commitment to promote human rights of LGBTI people. One female beneficiary in Serbia realized that while she will not be running for political position in her country, her commitment to educate political leaders and party members will enable future generations of LGBTI people to serve openly and without discrimination in the civil service, participate in political parties and legislative bodies, and be a public voice for human rights of LGBTI people.

For one beneficiary of the democratic participation training in Serbia, running for office drew increased visibility and attacks from local media, which contributed to burn out. Future iterations of the training should focus time on providing skills and approaches to withstanding anti-LGBTI media attacks.

This evaluation also found that other GDP-supported trainings have long-term benefits for individual beneficiaries. In Colombia, one grantee organization/CSO partner administers trainings to local businesses on creating inclusive environments for LGBTI employees. For one business owner, this training was transformative in reducing high turnover of LGBTI employees.

4.2.3 How effective have the CommsLabs been in strengthening advocacy?

Beneficiaries found CommsLabs to be a valuable resource in strengthening individual and organizational advocacy efforts. First, CommsLabs trainings gave many beneficiaries a sense of trust and confidence in the use of social media and technology for their advocacy efforts. Several of the beneficiaries interviewed spoke about the importance and significance of personal (as opposed to organizational) use of communication, social media, and technology in providing support and empowerment to other LGBTI individuals and other CSOs. CommsLabs also provided beneficiaries with the tools to use social media to advance the human rights of LGBTI people. For instance, according to a beneficiary, the CommsLabs brought together LGBTI people, allies, and technologists from the region and created a space for cross-organizational *learning, collaboration, and support*.

“The [CommsLab] helped me to gain confidence and gave me tools to more actively share my life experiences...with others. The skills I gained helped me to create a small online support group where the members share information and ideas... This is the power of knowledge of how to use social media well. – Beneficiary, South Africa

4.2.4 What is the value of the GDP’s research activities? How have the research products been used?

We found that several of the landscape analyses, as well as the research on the relationship between LGBT inclusion and economic development, provided and equipped many of the GDP’s partners with a robust baseline for targeted advocacy efforts. The GDP’s research activities have been critical to building a body of knowledge about the experiences of LGBTI people in developing countries, and the relationship between LGBTI inclusion/well-being and economic development.

Landscape Analyses

Landscape analyses by Astraea have had extensive impacts on grantee organizations/CSO partners, individual beneficiaries, and entities outside the GDP. Within the GDP, landscape analyses have had positive impacts on grantee organizations. To create each report, Astraea engaged an independent researcher and ensured that grantee organizations provided information and guidance through in-depth interviews, consultations, and report reviews. This consultation of grantee organizations was critical for the quality/accuracy of the landscape analysis, helped contribute to the research capacities of each organization, and allowed them to develop solutions to the advocacy challenges raised in landscape analyses.

Additionally, landscape analyses allowed grantee organizations, implementing partners, and donor partners to create targeted, informed programming. According to some

beneficiaries, these research efforts and their findings have proven to be critical to identifying and working to achieve local priorities. Further, beneficiaries found the recommendations for allies, advocates, and funders provided in the various research products truly reflect the needs and priorities identified by the LGBTI people in the GDP focus countries. Lastly, landscape analyses provided individual beneficiaries and grantee organizations opportunities to share their experiences. A community-based key informant who participated in developing a landscape analysis stated that the research was an empowering way to share experiences of violence and discrimination with a wider audience. He also suggested that the acknowledgment of LGBTI experiences provided them with a sense of visibility they have not previously experienced.

Landscape analyses have also been beneficial outside of the GDP. As an implementing partner reports, landscape analyses have provided USAID Missions in each focus country with a valuable consolidated snapshot of the realities of LGBTI people. Missions in each country have also used landscape analyses as a reference for creating or strengthening relationships with CSOs working to advance the human rights of LGBTI people. Further, Missions in each country also use landscape analyses as a reference for identifying opportunities to create or strengthen relationships with CSOs in each country.

*The Relationship between LGBT Inclusion and Economic Development: An Analysis of Emerging Economies*²⁵

This publication by the Williams Institute has had expansive impacts within and outside of the GDP. This report provided the first in-depth analysis that explored the cost of economic exclusion of LGBTI people, and has been cited by many subsequent studies and reports. This study was particularly helpful for framing the importance of improved policy for LGBTI people and demonstrating to governments in developing countries that the exclusion and discrimination of LGBTI people is detrimental to a country's overall well-being. This study laid the foundation for many trainings around inclusion of LGBTI people, and helped to design programming for making businesses around the world understand the importance of non-discriminatory practices. As a result of this study, the authors have received speaking engagements and serve in advisory roles for initiatives that influence policy on protections from anti-LGBTI violence and discrimination.

This publication also had extensive impacts within the GDP, especially for activities related to NGLCC. As one implementing partner reported, this report was valuable in

²⁵ Badgett, M., Nezhad, S., Waaldijk, K., & van der Meulen Rodgers, Y. (2014). *The Relationship between LGBT Inclusion and Economic Development: An Analysis of Emerging Economies*. UCLA: The Williams Institute. It is available [here](#).

engaging corporations and contextualizing trainings as it provided the language and statistics that allowed businesses to better understand the importance of creating environments that were supportive of LGBTI people.

Grantee organizations/CSO partners in focus countries were not uniformly aware of the existence of this publication. As such, for this, and future publications, it may be helpful to produce versions (and/or infographics showing key findings) in the languages of GDP focus countries, and ensure distribution to partners at all levels.

4.2.5 Have beneficiary organizations supported individuals across the LGBTI spectrum? To what extent? Why or why not? What were the challenges with providing this support?

The evaluation had limited ability to assess the extent to which individuals across the LGBTI spectrum were supported. Although MSC stories demonstrated high visibility of lesbian, gay, and transgender individuals, there were fewer stories of bisexual individuals and no data collected on the experiences of intersex individuals. However, stories demonstrated that diversity of identity, such as socioeconomic status and race, was captured in other ways:

“As a poor, gay, black man, barriers are multiple, in our country... You feel excluded from the rest... [Being] a poor black gay man is not easy, but after [working with] the [grantee] organization, participating in the training, and receiving moral support, I no longer feel excluded.”

5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This evaluation found that the GDP has been very effective in achieving its goals, and that the unique structure of the GDP was a driving factor for its efficacy. The multi-partner structure of the GDP promoted positive changes within participating organizations at all levels including internal growth, expansion of programs, improved management systems, and broad expansion of existing networks.

The GDP’s Interventions Have Been Effective

The evaluation concludes that the 1) small grants to LGBTI CSOs were effectively used to help advance protections from violence and discrimination; 2) trainings have significantly strengthened the capacities and abilities of LGBTI people and organizations advocate for their own human rights and improve their lives; 3) research and analysis produced under the GDP have been used by broad range of stakeholders to inform in-country programming and raise awareness of the harsh realities faced by LGBTI people in developing countries, as well as to increase understanding of the connections

between LGBTI inclusion and economic development; and 4) economic empowerment initiatives have provided LGBTI individuals in developing countries with networks, skills, and resources to advance economically despite the stigma and discrimination they face.

The GDP Has Had Positive Impacts on Beneficiaries

The GDP has had wide-spanning positive impacts on beneficiaries, especially in addressing the day-to-day challenges that result from the violence and discrimination faced by LGBTI individuals. Grants, training (i.e., CommsLabs, democratic participation trainings), and research activities have helped grantee organizations provide improved support for individual beneficiaries. This evaluation also found that grantee organizations helped individual beneficiaries navigate social and institutional discrimination, develop a greater awareness of their human rights, and advocate for themselves and others. These tools have helped beneficiaries identify and create inclusive environments, including work places. The evaluation also found that GDP activities had some unexpected positive impacts on beneficiaries, including 1) confidence building, 2) access to networks that reduced feelings of isolation and unlocked opportunities for organizing, and 3) a sense of personal empowerment and ability to advocate for protections and rights.

The GDP Has Had Positive Impacts on All Partners

This evaluation also found that the GDP had distinct and positive impacts for grantee organizations/CSO partners and implementing partner organizations. For grantee organizations/CSO partners, the GDP was instrumental in addressing specific vulnerabilities (i.e., violence, discrimination) across LGBTI groups, and promoting the effective and sustainable use of financial resources. Further trainings supported by the GDP helped grantee organizations and individual beneficiaries expand valuable skills in organizational leadership, democratic participation, and digital safety/advocacy. For implementing partners, the GDP improved their financial sustainability through resource mobilization and leveraging new funding. These findings indicate that the collaborative, coordinated efforts of the GDP are critical to continued efforts to protect LGBTI people in developing countries from violence and discrimination.

The GDP Improved Capacity of Implementing Partners and Grantee Organizations/CSO Partners

The evaluation findings indicate that the GDP has increased the capacity of implementing partners and grantee organizations/CSO partners, and led to changes in approaches used by these organizations while building the capacity of LGBTI individuals and CSOs. The GDP inspired both a top-down organizational change (beginning with revisions to internal policies and practices) and a bottom-up organizational approach (e.g., provision of skills to staff). The GDP also inspired

organizations and individual community members to form new networks or join existing ones to achieve specific outcomes. The evaluation found that the GDP provided LGBTI individuals and staff members of the grantee organizations with unprecedented in-depth trainings on organizational leadership, political participation, digital security, and communications. Through thematic workshops, learning exchanges, partner meetings at the local, regional, and global level, and engagement with experts in human rights, politics, and technology, the GDP strengthened the capacity of LGBTI individuals and staff members of grantee organizations/CSO partners.

The GDP triggered internal growth and organizational changes, including the expansion of programs and targets, changes in organizational structure, and the strengthening of management mechanisms and approaches. It spurred organizational reflection and developments such as the expansion from domestic to international operations, the hiring of new technical and administrative staff, and increased awareness of violence and discrimination faced by LGBTI people among staff members. Finally, there are positive effects regarding strengthened management systems and internal structures and practices including data collection, reporting, and M&E whereby organizations have implemented changes to facilitate operational improvements. This has led to the ability to overcome challenges in pursuing organizational objectives.

The GDP Enhanced Coordination Among Partners

The evaluation revealed that the GDP enhanced coordination between/among implementing/donor partners and grantee organizations/CSO partners and helped create and sustain linkages between LGBTI CSOs and other stakeholders. It also helped to build strong, multi-cultural, and multi-national networks of connections with bilateral, multilateral, or grassroots-based LGBTI organizations, like-minded groups, and LGBTI people locally, regionally, and globally.

The GDP Has Been Effective in Leveraging Additional Resources, Linkages, Partnerships, and Opportunities

The GDP helped partner organizations at all levels of the GDP mobilize additional resources and improved, and in some instances built, the capacity of organizations to leverage new financial opportunities. This includes in-kind contributions, donations, and matching grants. Second, the GDP increased the capacity of partners to seek resources from a diverse pool of funders. The learning opportunities provided by the GDP have improved organizations' skills in proposal writing and fundraising, which has led to a number of concrete improvements in numbers of approved grants. Finally, the GDP facilitated a reflection on financial sustainability and the effective use of resources among grantee organizations.

The GDP Led to Measurable Gains in Individual and Organizational Abilities and Confidence

The GDP has been effective in building partner organizations' confidence and trust in their own organizational knowledge, skills, abilities, and capacity to provide support to LGBTI individuals and communities. This is particularly true for implementing partners and grantee organizations. These effects have clear and direct impacts on the organizations and their beneficiaries. It helped the organizations implement effective and sustainable strategies, increase practical efforts to support and empower LGBTI individuals, and overcome challenges in pursuing their objectives. The evaluation also found that the GDP increased the global footprint and recognition of partner organizations at all levels of the GDP, and provided them with increased visibility, credibility, and reputation at the local, regional, or global level.

There Were Five Key Drivers of the GDP's Effectiveness

The evaluation identified the following five key drivers of the GDP's effectiveness:

- **Structure:** The government-led, multi-partner, multi-stakeholder, and multi-sectoral private-public structure of the GDP allowed for coordination and cross-pollination among resource partners, implementing partners, and grantee organizations/CSO partners and across a broad swath of domestic and international stakeholders. The bilateral character of the GDP also provided an opportunity for USAID and Sida to closely work together. This ensured a high degree of commitment, communication, and accountability among all partners. It has also been an effective model in bringing international attention on LGBTI issues, which is particularly useful in settings with no or very little attention paid to the needs and vulnerabilities of LGBTI individuals.
- **Partners:** Strategic engagement with implementing partners that are already experts and well networked in the field of human rights of LGBTI people was crucial. These organizations, through their expertise and a long-term commitment to the advancement of human rights of LGBTI people, were able to provide extensive technical support, build trust among partners, discuss goals and motivation for collaboration, develop a shared agenda and vision, and share best practices and lessons learned in supporting and empowering LGBTI individuals and organizations. The evaluation also found that the leadership of these partners as well as the leadership and commitment of individual 'champions' within these organizations facilitates effective change and support.
- **Flexibility:** The funding/grant-making strategy based on the premise of flexibility and long-term engagement (including in organizational development and leadership strengthening) was effective. The evaluation found that the flexibility of the GDP funding and grant-making allowed for unplanned undertakings and addressing urgent needs and vulnerabilities of the grantee organizations and their beneficiaries.

The opportunity to adjust the way organizations implemented, tracked, and measured the results was also essential.

- **Approach:** The application of human capital and human rights-based approaches to support and empower LGBTI individuals and organizations was effective. Investing in a multi-dimensional approach was found to be effective in providing support and empowerment to LGBTI individuals and organizations as they advocate for their own human rights and seek to improve their lives.
- **Focus:** Given the specific challenges faced by LGBTI people in developing countries, the exclusive focus on LGBTI populations was appropriate and essential to achieve the objectives. Because of this focus, all partners had a shared sensitivity to and understanding of safety and security considerations and were able to build trust and communicate with one another effectively.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This evaluation found that the GDP's interventions resulted in unique benefits for participants at all levels. The evaluation identified several opportunities, challenges, and potential risks for the GDP to consider as it continues to make significant achievements in protecting LGBTI people in developing countries from violence and discrimination. We present these challenges below along with recommendations on how they can be addressed. These recommendations are not limited to specific locations, but are relevant across all GDP focus countries. However, where appropriate or relevant, roles, and responsibilities are matched with selected partner organizations.

First, the GDP could better facilitate improved, long-term connections, coordination, and communication between organizations at all levels (1 – donor, 2 – implementing partner, 3 – grantee organization/CSO partner), potentially including the creation of a private listserv or a dedicated space for sharing resources, best practices, success stories, and lessons learned. The evaluation also found that crucial to the GDP's success has been its approach to ensuring interventions are highly tailored to the unique contexts and needs of each focus country; this approach should be maintained, and in some cases enhanced, moving forward. This evaluation also found opportunities for new or expanded programming focused on providing psychosocial support and emergency response grants to LGBTI individuals/organizations and infusing research (i.e., academic quantitative analysis) and economic empowerment considerations across the GDP. Finally, the evaluation recommends the GDP consider applying strategic advocacy and communications efforts to engage allies and a broader audiences to address the root causes of violence and discrimination facing LGBTI people.

Facilitate Improved Long-Term Connections, Coordination, and Communication Within the Partnership

The evaluation findings suggest that while the GDP boosted the network of connected LGBTI individuals and like-minded organizations around the world, internal communication and coordination could have been improved. Additionally, the GDP may not have fully taken advantage of an opportunity to create lasting and sustainable channels for coordination and communication. To address this, we recommend the following:

- Ensure regular updates are provided by donor partners to implementing partners and grantee organizations/CSO partners about GDP-specific developments including the structure, changes in technical and administrative staff, milestones in the progress towards outcomes in each focus country, and other developments relevant to the partners;
- Where possible, conduct intra-partner communication (i.e., between implementing partners and grantee organizations/CSO organizations) in regional languages used by the grantee organizations.
- Create a GDP-specific listserv, private webpage, or online group managed by donor partners or designated implementing partners, where program outcomes, results, and lessons learned can be featured and shared with partner organizations at all levels of the GDP. Such a platform could also serve as a repository of best practices in supporting and empowering LGBTI individuals and CSOs in developing countries;
- Establish an active “alumni network” through which professional contacts, services, and opportunities (including programmatic and funding opportunities) can be shared, and support can be made available beyond the life of any single project; and
- Pursue and engage in dialogue with local CSOs. This includes enhancing connections between implementing partners and grantee organizations in the focus countries and local representatives of USAID Missions and Swedish Embassies in those countries. Both GDP donor partners are well positioned to facilitate such targeted introductions and serve as a ‘connector’ between the Missions/Embassies and the local organizations. Such connections could have significant impacts – both for the CSOs and Mission/Embassy staff. CSOs could provide local knowledge and updates, and Mission/Embassy staff could help provide engagement/advocacy platforms and information on potential funding opportunities.

Continue and Enhance Efforts to Tailor Interventions to the Country Context

While utmost effort has been made to ensure that interventions are relevant and sensitive to the local country context, culture, and priorities, the evaluation identified some limitations and missed opportunities. For example, in some trainings the information delivered and facilitation approach could have been more sensitive to

complex socioeconomic conditions, diversity within the LGBTI community, and the legal and policy environments. To enhance country contextualization efforts, we recommend the following:

- Prior to facilitating any training or activity, implementing partners and CSO partners should review relevant existing literature and conduct consultations with a broad range of experts and stakeholders (particularly in-country representatives of the beneficiary group) to better understand the complexities of LGBTI issues and lived realities in the focus country. The findings from the literature review and expert/stakeholder consultations should inform all project designs, and will help ensure that interventions are fully informed by the local legal, social, and cultural realities of the focus country.
- In all capacity-building activities, enhance efforts to ensure that LGBTI leaders from the focus countries are positioned not only as “trainees” but as “experts.” Efforts to increase participation/leadership of LGBTI people from the focus countries should be sensitive to the diversity *within* the LGBTI community – and proactive steps should be taken to ensure the active participation/leadership of lesbians, gay men, bisexual people, transgender men and women, and intersex individuals from racially, ethnically, and culturally diverse backgrounds. Particular attention should be given to enhancing participation/leadership of bisexual and intersex individuals, which may have been underrepresented in the GDP.

Expand Programs That Address Population Needs and Enhance Understanding

This evaluation found several opportunities for expanded programming that addresses needs faced by LGBTI people in developing countries and helps better define and understand the levels and causes of anti-LGBTI stigma, violence, and discrimination. Highlighted opportunities include the development of an emergency response grant fund, the provision of psychosocial support, the infusion of economic empowerment considerations through programs, and an increased focus on foundational research. This evaluation recommends the following:

- Augment existing efforts with an emergency response grant fund. Given the safety and security risks inherent in this work, there can be many unplanned/unforeseen circumstances (i.e., individuals participating in projects get arrested, detained, evicted, threatened, abused, etc.). Having the ability to quickly deploy emergency response grants outside of the typical grant/project cycle would help protect and support beneficiaries facing violence and discrimination.
- Include, where appropriate, psychosocial support services (i.e., support groups, healing exercises) to help LGBTI individuals face challenges resulting from stigma, violence, and discrimination – including depression, isolation from families, fear, anxiety, and burn-out.

- Infuse economic empowerment considerations through programming, where appropriate, to address the economic discrimination faced by LGBTI people (who often lack family support and employment protections). Exclusion and discrimination make it more difficult for LGBTI people to earn money, stay secure, and pursue their goals. The evaluation found there could be more focus on understanding socio-economic background of beneficiaries, and that programs should consider adding support for income-generation for beneficiaries
- Increase research efforts to better understand the issues and inform policy. The evaluation found research, particularly research with academic analysis, to be impactful in raising awareness of the issues faced by LGBTI people in developing countries, framing conversations around facts and analysis, and providing a tool for engagement with policy makers. Developing, publishing, and widely disseminating additional country-, regional-, and/or global research on legal protections, stigma, violence, discrimination, and development disparities for LGBTI people in developing countries would be highly impactful.

Create Transformative Change and Address Root Causes Through Strategic Advocacy and Communications

This evaluation also makes an additional recommendation based on the evaluator's expert opinion and experience in global advocacy for the human rights of LGBTI individuals. In addition to the specific activities and programs aimed to support and empower LGBTI individuals, efforts could be taken to address the root causes of anti-LGBTI violence and discrimination. Moving forward, we recommend considering activities and interventions that seek to create transformative change by (i) fostering critical examination of the inequalities and gender roles, norms, and dynamics affecting LGBTI people; (ii) recognizing and strengthening positive norms that support gender equality and an enabling environment that is inclusive of LGBTI individuals; and (iii) promoting the relative position of LGBTI people and other marginalized groups, and transforming the underlying social structures, policies, and broadly-held social norms, beliefs, and attitudes that perpetuate stigma, discrimination, and violence against LGBTI people. To this end, we recommend the following:

- With the active engagement of communications/social science experts and local LGBTI CSO representatives, facilitate workshops to help develop strategic communications and advocacy campaigns (including long-term action plans) that address the root causes of anti-LGBTI stigma, violence, and discrimination.
- Facilitate follow-on trainings and identify advocacy opportunities that help local LGBTI leaders share their messages/campaigns with influential stakeholders.
- Actively engage allies (i.e., representatives of other marginalized groups, family members of LGBTI people) and a broad audience (particularly those in positions of

decision-making and social influence – i.e., government stakeholders, academia, print/online media) in these strategic advocacy and communications efforts.

- Through inclusion of non-LGBTI people in these advocacy and communications activities and interventions, raise awareness among the broader population about gender equality, SOGIE issues, and the human rights of LGBTI people.

Overall, this evaluation found that the GDP has been effective in achieving its objectives and led to several positive unexpected outcomes. The GDP has been successful in fostering organizational change, strengthening capacity building, leveraging resources, enhancing coordination, and building skills. The GDP's success can be attributed to its structure, partners, flexibility, approach, and focus. As the GDP continues to make significant achievements in the advancement of the human rights of LGBTI individuals, partners should consider the recommendations for enhanced coordination/communication, country contextualization, and new/expanded programming streams based on emerging needs.